

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

ROBERT REYNOLDS,
JOSH LEE,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rabbi Bernard Bergman, of the Home of the Sons and Daughters of Israel, New York City, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of the Universe! We beseech Thee, bless our Chief Executive and prosper the enterprises of the august Members of this assembly, the chosen representatives of the great American people, gathered here in solemn deliberation in this supreme moment of their Nation's need. Merciful God, grant them light and guidance in this perilous hour of humanity's agony. Grant them wisdom and foresight to navigate the ship of state amidst the sundry obstructions and obstacles besetting our course, and guard them against those who seek to paralyze the arms of the brave defenders of our liberties who are now engaged in Thy forces, even as they are waging humanity's struggle on the battlefields of many continents and distant lands.

We beseech Thee, O Lord, look down from Thy throne of mercy upon Thy children of this liberty-loving Nation. Bless our brave effort and send glorious victory to our banners. Grant us, O Lord, Thy blessing, so that "the earth shall be filled again with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records

of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Post Office Department.
3. Department of War.
4. Maritime Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 254

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

May 25, 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PAT HARRISON, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 255

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

May 25, 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALVA B. ADAMS, late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 256

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

May 25, 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 257

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

May 25, 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALVA M. LUMPKIN, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a patriotic essay by a young man from my home city.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article from the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION AGAIN REARS ITS UGLY HEAD

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a group of 30 sincere Representatives recently gathered to plan restriction of liquor to men in our armed forces.

These gentlemen are as well intentioned as they are enthusiastically misguided.

Let them recall that prohibition is hardly dead and buried. They now wish to resurrect it. What a calamity that would be. As one who was constantly in the vanguard fighting prohibition from 1922 to 1932 in and out of the House, I can easily testify to prohibition's horrors—its chicanery, deceit, falsifying, bribery, bootlegging, violence, blackjacking, drunkenness, kidnaping, gangsterdom.

I say to these new prohibitionists, Do not let America again go off the deep end. For goodness sake they should think twice. We must prevent at all hazards a second plunge into the deep depths of iniquity.

These new prohibitionists want "legislation to protect the boys from undue temptation, especially youths away from home for the first time."

I hope nothing more than oratory will come out of this effort. These Representatives practically in effect say, "You young soldiers, you selectees, you are old enough to die for your country; you are old enough to be trusted with your country's safety, but we cannot trust you with a glass of beer; we cannot trust you off duty because you might be tempted to sip a bit of California wine, or imbibe a glass of Kentucky bourbon, or Pennsylvania or Maryland rye. Maybe a cocktail would perk you up after a day's work of drilling and maneuvers, but you are not mature enough. All outside Army ranks can have all they want, but not you soldiers."

Stop legal sale of wines, beer, and liquor to soldiers and you instantly make bootlegging a most profitable business around every camp and cantonment.

No. Be careful, you new prohibitionists. I remind you that the monster pro-

hibition first reared his ugly head with a bill for dryness around Army camps.

I warn the Nation to be on the alert. I warn the beer, wine, and liquor interests—who pay more taxes than any other group—to be on the job. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Get busy. Checkmate these efforts at national abstinence. Be on guard. Take no chances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MASON and Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from a small business man.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MONTANA AND COLORADO BOYS IN THE RAID ON TOKYO

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, with exultant pride I quote from an Associated Press dispatch, with a Washington date line, which appeared in one of my hometown papers in Montana:

PARTICIPATE IN RAID ON TOKYO

WASHINGTON, May 19.—Fliers from Billings, Mont., Colorado Springs, Colo., and Denver were among those who raided Tokyo.

As made public by the War Department, with next of kin, they were:

Corp. David J. Thatcher, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Thatcher, Box 307, Billings.

Lt. Harry C. McCool, Mrs. O. S. McCool, mother, 2520 West Pikes Peak Avenue, Colorado Springs.

Staff Sgt. P. J. Leonard, Mrs. P. J. Leonard, 3034 Race Street, Denver.

Another Montanan with the raiders was Sgt. Edward J. Saylor, of Brusett, Garfield County.

I believe there are not more than a thousand people in Garfield County, yet one of the participants in that remarkable exploit came from that county. These two young men from the district in Montana which I have the honor to represent, in participating in one of the most daring and unprecedented raids of this war, typify the manhood of my State. My people did not want war; but once in, they will be there at the finish, fighting with their all.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects; in one, to include a resolution on the celebration of Thomas Jefferson's birthday; and in the other, to include one paragraph from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow after disposition of all matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include part of my own news letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

FREE LIFE INSURANCE TO SERVICE MEN

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 last I called to the attention of the House the fact that I had introduced legislation which would give to all of the men and women in the armed services \$5,000 of Government life insurance without cost to them. I am delighted at this time to be able to compliment the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate upon the fact that it has favorably reported today legislation of this type.

That committee has approved a new provision in the soldiers' allotment and allowance bill which makes war-risk insurance compulsory. All men and women in our armed forces would be required to have \$10,000 of Government insurance. The service man or woman would pay 35 cents per month on each \$1,000 of insurance and the Government would pay the balance. For \$10,000 this would amount to about \$3.50 for the service man or woman and \$3 for the Government.

I have several times addressed the House urging that automatic compulsory insurance blanket every person entering our armed forces as soon as he or she is sworn in. I have urged that \$5,000 of this insurance be furnished free by the taxpayers of America in grateful recognition in a small way of the great unselfish service rendered our Nation by these young men at the fighting fronts.

May I urge upon the House Military Affairs Committee that it accept this provision for compulsory automatic insurance. Such action will save untold heartaches in the future. Soldiers will give just a little bit more, if possible, of fighting energy for our United States of

America knowing that their wives, children, and dear ones back home are protected against want if the supreme sacrifice is asked of them.

If possible, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer this provision as an amendment to the House soldiers' allotment and allowance bill. I plead with you, Members of the House, to aid in this expression of fairness to the service men and women of today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a paper on farm problems delivered recently by Dr. Young, of Purdue University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article in the Times-Herald regarding the valor of the nurses at Corregidor. One of those nurses was a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following any previous orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROMOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEAGALL) there were—ayes 96, noes 0.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 346, nays 0, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—346

Allen, Ill.	Faddis	Lesinski
Allen, La.	Fellows	Lewis
Andersen, H. Carl	Fenton	Ludlow
Anderson, Calif.	Fish	Lynch
Anderson, N. Mex.	Fitzgerald	McCormack
Andresen, August H.	Flaherty	McGehee
Andrews	Flannagan	McGranery
Angell	Fogarty	McGregor
Arends	Folger	McKeough
Arnold	Forand	McLaughlin
Baldwin	Ford, Leland M.	McLean
Barden	Ford, Thomas F.	McMillan
Barnes	Fulmer	Maas
Bates, Ky.	Gale	MacIora
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	Mahon
Baumhart	Gathings	Manasco
Beiter	Gavagan	Mansfield
Beckworth	Gearhart	Martin, Iowa
Bender	Gehrmann	Martin, Mass.
Bishop	Gerlach	Mason
Bland	Gillie	May
Bloom	Gore	Merritt
Boehne	Gossett	Meyer, Md.
Boggs	Graham	Michener
Boren	Grant, Ala.	Mills, Ark.
Boykin	Gregory	Mills, La.
Bradley, Mich.	Haines	Mitchell
Brooks	Hall	Mott
Brown, Ga.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mundt
Brown, Ohio	Leonard W.	Murdoch
Bryson	Halleck	Murray
Buck	Hancock	Myers, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Hare	Nelson
Burch	Harness	Norrell
Burdick	Harris, Ark.	Norton
Burgin	Harris, Va.	O'Brien, Mich.
Butler	Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.
Byrne	Harter	O'Connor
Camp	Hartley	O'Hara
Canfield	Healey	O'Leary
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Oliver
Cannon, Mo.	Heffernan	O'Neal
Capozzoli	Heidinger	O'Toole
Carter	Hess	Pace
Cartwright	Hill, Colo.	Paddock
Case, S. Dak.	Hill, Wash.	Patman
Celler	Hobbs	Patton
Chenoweth	Hoffman	Pearson
Chiperfield	Holbrook	Peterson, Ga.
Claypool	Holmes	Pheffer
Clevenger	Hook	William T.
Cochran	Hope	Pierce
Coffee, Nebr.	Houston	Pittenger
Coffee, Wash.	Howell	Ploeser
Cole, N. Y.	Hull	Poage
Colmer	Hunter	Powers
Cooley	Imhoff	Priest
Cooper	Izac	Rabaut
Copeland	Jackson	Ramsay
Costello	Jacobsen	Ramspeck
Courtney	Jarman	Randolph
Cox	Jenkins, Ohio	Rankin, Miss.
Cravens	Jenks, N. H.	Rankin, Mont.
Crawford	Jennings	Reed, Ill.
Creal	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Rich
Crowther	Johnson, N. Dak.	Richards
Culkin	Johnson, W. Va.	Rivers
Cunningham	Jones	Rizley
Curtis	Jonkman	Robertson
D'Alesandro	Kean	Robinson, Va.
Davis, Ohio	Kee	Robinson, Utah
Davis, Tenn.	Keefe	Robson, Ky.
Day	Kefauver	Rockefeller
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Rockwell
Dewey	Kelly, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Dickstein	Kennedy	Rogers, Mass.
Dingell	Kennedy, Martin J.	Rogers, Okla.
Dirksen	Kennedy, Michael J.	Rolph
Disney	Keogh	Romjue
Domengeaux	Kilday	Russell
Dondero	Kinzer	Sabath
Doughton	Kirwan	Sacks
Downs	Kleberg	Sanders
Drewry	Klein	Satterfield
Duncan	Knutson	Sauthoff
Durham	Kunkel	Scanlon
Dworshak	Landis	Schulte
Eaton	Lane	Scott
Eberhart	Lanham	Secrest
Edmiston	Larrabee	Shafer, Mich.
Elliot, Mass.	Lea	Shanley
Elliot, Calif.	Leavy	Short
Elston	LeCompte	Sikes
Engel		Simpson
Englebright		Smith, Maine
		Smith, Ohio
		Smith, Va.

Smith, Wash.	Tarver	Wene
Smith, W. Va.	Tenerowicz	West
Snyder	Thill	Wheat
Somers, N. Y.	Thom	Whelchel
South	Thomas, N. J.	White
Sparkman	Thomason	Whittington
Spence	Tibbott	Wickersham
Springer	Tolan	Wigglesworth
Starnes, Ala.	Traynor	Williams
Steagall	Treadway	Wilson
Stearns, N. H.	Van Zandt	Wolcott
Stefan	Vincent, Ky.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stevenson	Vinson, Ga.	Wolverton, N. J.
Stratton	Voorhis, Calif.	Woodruff, Mich.
Sullivan	Vorys, Ohio	Woodrum, Va.
Summers, Tex.	Wadsworth	Wright
Sutphin	Ward	Young
Sweeney	Wasielewski	Youngdahl
Taber	Weaver	Zimmerman
Talle	Weiss	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—84

Barry	Granger	Patrick
Beam	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.
Bell	Green	Pfeifer
Bennett	Guyer	Joseph L.
Blackney	Gwynne	Plauché
Bolton	Harrington	Plumley
Bonner	Hendricks	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Pa.	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Buckley, Minn.	Jarrett	Sasscer
Buckley, N. Y.	Johns	Schaefer, Ill.
Byron	Johnson, Ill.	Schuetz
Carlson	Johnson, Ind.	Scrugham
Casey, Mass.	Johnson, N. Y.	Shannon
Chapman	Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Clark	Kerr	Sheridan
Clason	Kilburn	Smith, Pa.
Cluett	Kocalkowski	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Md.	Kopplemann	Sumner, Ill.
Collins	Kramer	Talbot
Cullen	Lambertson	Terry
Dies	McIntyre	Thomas, Tex.
Ditter	Maciejewski	Tinkham
Douglas	Magnuson	Vreeland
Ellis	Marcantonio	Walter
Fitzpatrick	Monroney	Welch
Ford, Miss.	Moser	Whitten
Gibson	Nichols	Winter
Gifford	O'Day	Worley
Gilchrist	Osmers	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Clark with Mr. Bennett.	Mr. Cullen with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Kilburn.	Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Carlson.	Mr. Monroney with Mr. Johns.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Rees of Kansas.	Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Winter.	Mr. Terry with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Lambertson.	Mr. Chapman with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer with Mr. Plumley.	Mr. Collins with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Douglas.	Mr. Ellis with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Osmers.	Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Gwynne.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Vreeland.	Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.	Mr. Green with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Blackney.	Mr. Sasser with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.	Mr. Bell with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.	Mr. Walter with Mr. Talbot.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Welch.	Mr. Harrington with Miss Sumner of Illinois.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Tinkham.	Mr. Plauché with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.	Mr. Beam with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Maciejewski.	Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. Kramer with Mrs. Byron.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Kocalkowski with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Moser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may have the privilege of sitting during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,

Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
JOSH LEE,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed

upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

This bill relates to a number of matters which are largely of an administrative nature. It was passed by the House several months before war was declared. The Senate amendments make changes which are chiefly necessary by reason of the different conditions which exist now that this country is engaged in war. The conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 6, 8, 17, 25, 27, 30, 36, 38, 41, 45, 47, 49, and 53: These amendments strike out provisions in different sections of the House bill which limited the period during which such sections were to remain in effect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942. In lieu of these limitations, Senate amendment No. 55 provides that the act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the Congress or the President may designate.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 7, 16, 18, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 51, and 52: These amendments correct section numbers and make other clerical and clarifying changes.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6 suspend the limitation as to the number of Army officers who may participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights.

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 12 provide that places in Alaska shall be treated as outside the continental United States for the purposes of section 3, relating to appointment and transfer of personnel.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 13 strike out language which is made unnecessary by reason of amendments 14 and 15.

Amendment No. 14 provides that when civilian employees are on duty within zones from which their dependents should be evacuated, or are sent to places where their dependents cannot accompany them for military reasons, their dependents and household effects may be moved at Government expense.

Amendment No. 15 provides that in certain cases where civilian employees are assigned to temporary duty away from their permanent stations their dependents and household effects may be moved at Government expense.

Amendment No. 19 provides that funds available for paying travel allowances shall be available for paying allowances authorized for dependents of Army personnel without regard to whether such personnel is ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 15 days, and for the payment of allowances for travel from home to first station, and from last station to home, when ordered to or relieved from active duty.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21 contain the same provisions with respect to military personnel as are contained in amendments 14 and 15, respectively, with respect to civilian employees.

Amendment No. 22 provides that military personnel for whom transportation of household effects is authorized may elect to have such household effects moved at Government expense to any place in the United States, for storage at their own expense for the duration of the war.

Amendment No. 23 strikes out language relating to matters which are covered by section 4 of the bill, as amended by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28 makes the provisions of section 6 applicable to the War Shipping Administration, which has been created since the bill passed the House.

Amendment No. 50 strikes out section 15 of the House bill, as the subject matter is now covered by the First and Second War Powers Acts.

Amendment No. 54 is a saving provision with regard to the First and Second War Power Acts.

Amendment No. 55 is the provision limiting the effective period of the act which was referred to above.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DOW W. HARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe a very brief explanation of this report will be sufficient to satisfy the Members of the House.

This bill was passed by the House in April 1941. It went to the Senate and was not considered there until the month of May 1942, a little more than a year after it was passed by the House.

The bill relates to numerous matters affecting the military operations of the War Department and the military forces and, of course, authorizes appropriations for fiscal years. The War Department has found that due to conditions which have arisen since the declaration of war and since the country has been involved in actual military operations around the world, it is necessary not only to move troops from one place to another but to evacuate the families of soldiers in many parts of the world from one area to another. Because of this the War Department has been very much limited in the expenditure of funds by reason of the fiscal year limitation.

The Senate placed 55 amendments in the bill, and they are divided into 3 groups. The amendment relating to the removal of the fiscal year limitations is dealt with in about 10 different amendments. The others are merely clarifying so as to conform the other provisions of the bill to that provision.

The provisions in another group are those which make it possible for the Army to use any funds they have on hand, regardless of the fiscal year for which they were appropriated, in transporting men from one place to another.

Another provision is that where the men's household goods have to be moved, say from Camp Belvoir to Camp Meade, the Army finds that it is cheaper to provide storage for these goods and transport the men, where they have families, without transporting the household goods. Then, in some instances, where the families have to go back to the civilian communities, they can remove them to a place in their own State or in their own community, where they are provided with accommodations and assistance from relatives and friends.

All this report does is to make more convenient the conduct of the military operations, and provides more expeditious use of the funds.

Mr. SECRET. Is this limited to the duration of the war?

Mr. MAY. It is limited to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. If there are no questions, and no one cares to speak upon any provision of the bill, I move the previous question upon the report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION OF DEFENSE WORKERS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 316) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BOREN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there a limitation on the time for debate?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not include any limitation of time in his request.

Mr. TABER. The time consumed will not be over 10 minutes, probably.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It may take more than that, but the matter will be disposed of very quickly.

Mr. BOREN. There is no desire to set any length of time, then.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 316, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in the greatest war—extending over the widest area—affecting the largest number of people—involving the most vital issues—fraught with the gravest consequences—and waged with the most destructive weapons in the annals of mankind.

In this struggle the merits of our form of government, the efficiency of our economic system, our capacity for production, and the temper and spirit of the American people are being tested as never before. More is at stake than in any previous war. At Yorktown, at New Orleans, and at Gettysburg only our own destiny hung in the balance. Had we lost, we could have looked forward to another field and another day. But today we defend the last citadel of freedom on earth. If America fails, democracy fails, self-government perishes, and the clock of time marking the progress of human rights is set back a thousand years.

How significant, then, is the dawning realization that we are winning the war. Slowly, painfully, at staggering cost and mounting sacrifice, we are moving at last, from defeat toward victory. At last we are reaching comparable mobilization and production.

The flood of weapons and munitions pouring from American factories, and now on its way to our Allies and our own forces at the front, exceeds all estimates,

and it is just beginning. By 1943, when we reach full production, it will dwarf into insignificance all former military and industrial achievements.

In March we put, in round numbers, \$3,000,000,000 worth of war material on the line; in April, three and a half billion; this month it will be four billion; this fall, \$5,000,000,000 per month; next spring \$6,000,000,000; a year from today, \$7,000,000,000 per month. And that does not mean the mere expenditure of dollars. It means that amount in the latest, most efficient, most effective tanks, planes, and guns in the largest quantities produced anywhere in the world.

Already we are taking command of the air, the first step toward supremacy in modern warfare. On the ground, our tanks are meeting every test on Russian, African, and Australian fronts. And our under-water craft, now giving an account of itself in every quarter of the globe, is being augmented at a rate unprecedented in naval construction.

Our mobilization of manpower is just as impressive. With a standing army so small a year ago as to be inconsequential, men are being steadily called to the colors and inducted into the service at a rate which envisions 3,600,000 under arms by the opening of 1943 and an eventual minimum of 8,000,000 men as they are needed. Mobilization is proceeding in an orderly way with a notable lack of the scandals which attended the raising of the comparatively insignificant force of 1898 and the lack of facilities and equipment of 1917. Notwithstanding the speed with which this number of men is being mustered in, there have been no epidemics, no complications in commissary and ordnance departments, and our forces today are the best fed, best clothed, best equipped, with the smallest percentage of hospitalization ever enlisted under the American flag or any other flag in any war.

Never before has a nation been changed from peacetime basis to war status or has industry been converted from civil to military production so completely and in so short a time. The speed and skill with which the transition has been effected border on the miraculous.

Through what agency have the American people effected this remarkable transformation? Primarily through the American Congress, representing them, acting for them, raising the money, appropriating the funds, auditing the expenditures, and shaping the legislation which has transformed the velvet glove and armed the mailed fist that is protecting American institutions and shaking the foundations of despotism throughout the world.

It is true that the immediate direction of the war is under the executive branch of the Government. But only Congress can declare war, can approve major appointments and commissions, can provide money, ships, planes, armament, and the sinews of war, without which the Executive power is impotent. In the last analysis it is Congress, representing the Nation by direct commission at the polls, which makes war, supports the war, and brings the war to a successful conclusion. And no Congress has more competently

exercised its functions or better performed its duties in that respect than the Seventy-seventh Congress. The Continental Congress at times all but abandoned Washington and his ragged regiments. The Civil War Congress, torn by internal dissension, was frequently a handicap rather than a help to Lincoln in his efforts to preserve the Union. The Spanish War Congress reeked with em-balmed-beef scandals and delinquencies in fever-racked camps that took a greater toll of American soldiers than the enemy. Even the World War Congress moved with such confusion and delay that not a single American plane or piece of American artillery ever reached the battle line. What a contrast presented by the Seventy-seventh Congress in its prompt and adequate provision for every need and contingency of a vastly greater theater of action. Its record is without parallel. It is writing in the conduct of this war one of the brightest chapters in American history.

In view of this remarkable record, you would naturally expect to see daily throughout the Nation editorial columns aflame with the commendation of the Congress, of its work, and the results secured.

What, then, is our astonishment to read in papers with national circulation such comments as this:

For collective brains, guts, vision, and leadership, the Seventy-seventh would rank close to the bottom of any of the 77 Congresses that have assembled biannually since 1789.

This quotation is not from German sources but was carried in an American magazine, and later incorporated in a vivid motion-picture dramatization that appeared on the screen in every city of importance in the country. It was also widely quoted over the major radio networks.

In the same article was this statement:

Not one thing that is worth a tinker's damn comes out of Washington.

That astonishing statement, of course, includes all activities of the Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. Nothing from the President, the Army, the Navy, the Congress, or the Supreme Court that is worth a damn.

But the gifted author of the article and the patriotic magazine which published it seems to have Congress particularly in mind, and adds:

This Congress contains no Websters, Clays, or Calhouns. * * * It contains an overflowing measure of hacks, demagogues, and timeservers.

Evidently the magazine considers the growth and progress of our people and our Government for the last hundred and seventeen years as negligible, for neither Webster, Clay, nor Calhoun have served in Congress since the Nineteenth Congress.

The article continues:

The case against the collective membership of the Seventy-seventh Congress is as clear as that which Thomas Jefferson made against George 3d in the Declaration of Independence.

It is to be noted that the author does not signal out any particular Member of the House or Senate. His indictment is

sweeping and condemns without benefit of clergy the entire membership of both bodies collectively and individually. To his jaundiced eye all are vile. Only he and his magazine are holy. All wisdom dieth with him.

Here is a further comment over a Nation-wide hook-up by another phylacteried commentator, quoted with commendation by another purveyor of jaundiced journalism:

Congress has remained a collection of 2-cent politicians * * * the ignorance and provincialism of Congress renders it incapable of meeting the needs of modern government. People don't give a damn what the average Senator or Congressman says * * * they know it is 99 percent tripe, ignorance, and demagoguery and not to be relied on.

But even these prescient gentlemen, with all their monopoly of the wisdom, virtue, and patriotism of the Nation, occasionally let their foot slip and one of them closes his phillipic with the admonition:

Warning: Don't forget the primaries. In the 1942 elections the people must choose better Congressmen.

A number of States have held their primaries and others have passed the date of filing since the enunciation of this stern call to duty and it would be taken for granted that there would already be in evidence indications of a tidal wave of outraged citizenry sweeping to the polls to turn out these arrant "liars," "incompetents," "demagogues," "grafters," and "traitors," comprising the Seventy-seventh Congress.

As a matter of fact in practically every State in which the will and intent of the electorate has been evidenced up to this time, the sitting Member has been endorsed for return to the Seventy-eighth Congress. Only in a few isolated instances, in which there were special issues, has there been any indication of more than the normal turnover due at the close of every 2-years' session.

So we give little heed to these self-anointed critics or their malicious slander of men who are as much a part of the American forces as the Army or the Navy, and who are working long hours far into the night exerting every effort within their power to bring victory to the American Army and safety to the American people. They have abused and vilified every Congress and every man in public life from Washington to Roosevelt. It is apparent at first glance that they are primarily interested in the circulation or box-office receipts rather than the welfare of the people or the success of the war.

But it must not be overlooked that their indictment of the legislative branch of the American Government is an indictment of the American people. Congress is a cross section of the Nation. Every Member of Congress has attained his seat against strenuous opposition and after desperate fighting. In every congressional district there are 500 men who would like to come to Congress and are perennially potential candidates for election.

In the covert battles, waged continuously and without respite in every congressional district, only the strongest and

ablest and sincerest win. It is a survival of the fittest. There is little opportunity for dissimulation or deception. Every candidate lives in a glass house, and the voters know him for what he is. That is especially true of the sitting Member. He cannot escape commitment. His opinions and decisions and his votes are constantly before the people in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the newspapers. Reporters and commentators search out every foible and weakness and pillory every delinquency, and he is elected or re-elected only because he is representative of the people of his district, because of his reflection of their point of view, because of his ability to champion their interests and aspirations. He is one of them and typical of the composite citizen voter of his section and State. And any criticism which can justly be made of him, his character, his ability, or his patriotism can as justly be made against the character, ability, and patriotism of the people who send him to Washington to represent them. Any reflection on him is a reflection on the people and the State from which he comes.

And yet I would not circumscribe by one word the flow of malodorous and unreasoning criticism that is the daily lot of every Congressman individually and collectively. It is a tribute to the glory and success of our form of government. No citizen of the Reich ever utters a word of such comment or criticism against the German Reichstag or the Norwegian Riksdag or the French Chamber of Deputies or the Italian Parliament. Only in the democracies is such criticism permitted. And so I thank God that here in America any citizen, responsible or otherwise, may still throw brickbats and custard pies, actually or verbally, at any official of the Government, including his own Representatives, his only safeguard against autocracy and despotism.

I trust the day will never come when it will be otherwise, for until that day does come men may still call their souls their own. Men will still be free—free to come and go, to speak and to worship, to live in security and happiness, under their own government, beneath their own vine and fig tree.

Too frequently there is a studied method in these criticisms of Congress, and they are part of a carefully devised program of derogation by those who seek to discredit representative government in order to serve their own interests. Congress is the bulwark of the people against economic and political as well as military dictatorship. Preservation of constitutional government depends on the maintenance of the National Legislature and its freedom of action. When Congress is destroyed the American Government is destroyed and as long as Congress survives and functions as it is functioning in this national emergency there need be no apprehension.

Let me reiterate. We are winning the war. Slowly but surely we are driving back the invaders, defending our frontiers, preserving our liberties and the freedom of the world. This Congress is meeting its obligations and discharging its duties as no Congress has met its obligations and discharged its duties from

the First Congress, under the Speakership of Speaker Muhlenburg, to the Seventy-seventh Congress, under the Speakership of Speaker RAYBURN.

It is true, as the columnist says, Daniel Webster is not a Member of this Congress. His measured perorations would be out of place in the work-a-day atmosphere of these mass-production sessions where only facts and figures count. And unquestionably he could drink under the table any of the 435 Members of this House. But it has been my privilege, perhaps more than any other one man, with the possible exception of Asher Hinds, to read attentively what is available of the proceedings of the Congresses in which he served and the proceedings of the succeeding Congresses down to the present time. And on the basis of a careful study of the records of these past Congresses, and the observations of the more than 30 years I have spent in various capacities on this floor, it is my conviction that in no previous Congress have the proceedings and debate attained a higher plane or evinced a higher degree of statesmanship than in this Congress. And certainly the present Congress has transacted vastly more business, and has handled it more expeditiously and efficiently, than has been transacted in any previous Congress. The transcript of the RECORD and the printed hearings and reports of committees demonstrate that beyond the possibility of contradiction.

I congratulate the Seventy-seventh Congress, its leadership, its committees, and its loyal rank and file, on the remarkable success of its conduct of the war. No criticism or calumny can detract from that record. Judged by actual accomplishments, which cannot be ignored or denied, the remarkable fidelity and success with which Congress has discharged its duties in this war is without precedent in American history.

In continuation of this record of efficiency, the Committee on Appropriations reports today a joint resolution providing additional funds for the training and education of defense workers.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my distinguished friend from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. First, let me congratulate the gentleman on his remarkable presentation of the record. His was not a defense of Congress, as this Congress needs no defense because the record speaks for itself. The indictment which is wrongfully placed by no disinterested parties against the Seventy-seventh Congress, according to the gentleman's preceding statement, has been carried somewhat to preceding Congresses. These other charges are equally groundless, regardless of the motives back of them. For instance, I saw in a movie the headline that the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1939 found Congress, as well as the entire Government, unprepared. I would like to ask the gentleman, is it not true that in the spring of 1938 we passed the largest regular peacetime Navy and Army appropriation bills in our history up to that date? Did not Congress pass an authorization bill for a two-ocean

Navy which was without precedent at that date, and that was in the Seventy-fifth Congress. The Seventy-sixth Congress, following farsighted leadership, took wise and necessary steps in preparation for this crisis.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our Nation is a peace-loving nation. Its institutions are founded upon an expectation of enduring peace. For many years we have proceeded under the universal impression that the Nation would never again be engaged in war. In view of that fact, the timely provision to which the gentleman refers was all the more remarkable in its forward looking policy.

The pending resolution provides for an appropriation of additional funds to complete the program for the education of defense workers. We are having a great demand for skilled workers. There is not a plant or factory in the Nation that is not short-handed. All need men, skilled men, and this work under the Bureau of Education, handled through the educational facilities of the States, is training young men in courses which fit them to go into the factories where war work is in progress and at once take up duties without loss of time or effort. For this work \$52,400,000 was provided in the last session, but on estimates made prior to Pearl Harbor, and, of course, prior to the declaration of war, and the increase in activity in industry, make it necessary to provide for more students and additional courses, and the appropriation of \$9,500,000 is expected to carry on the work for the remainder of the fiscal year.

If there are no further questions, I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself about 3 minutes. I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has taken this time to tell the American people the facts with reference to the situation here in Congress, with reference to the work that the committees of Congress do, the character of the debates here on the floor, and the devotion that is given by the Members of the House to their duties and the ability that is displayed. Personally I do not think that any responsible American source is going to challenge the ability of Congress. That attack upon the ability of Congress comes from a foreign reactionary source which has no real conception of the spirit and character which have builded America and which have carried us to the heights which we have attained.

This particular measure we have before us here today is to provide \$9,500,000 to continue to carry on the work of vocational training for defense workers, in the hands of local boards of education, according to the program that has already been carried for ten and a half months of this fiscal year. It is a program that is needed to increase the supply of those workers, not only for the defense factories but for such things as the president of Airacobra spoke about yesterday in connection with airplanes, that we may have proper ground mechanics to keep the airplanes in the air and keep them flying. I believe this money necessary to round out about \$67,000,000 that

is going to be spent on that supplementary vocational program in this fiscal year. Nearly 2,000,000 men are being trained and given refresher courses in all these programs, and I believe that it is necessary that this resolution be passed at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of this discussion I made inquiry as to the limitation of time under the plan to be pursued. Gentlemen on both sides of the aisle felt that about 10 minutes would be sufficient to dispose of this matter, and I presume that optimism is based on their long experience in putting through appropriations; but in checking this resolution I find that we have appropriated \$52,400,000 for this purpose, and they now come back for this \$9,500,000, to be dispensed with in 10 minutes, or a million a minute. I was interested in the comment that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made that the committee had carefully audited these appropriations, and I just want to raise a few points and questions. In the first place, the program of training workers is in about the same shape as the program for housing facilities in the Nation was a short time ago, when there was a score of agencies duplicating activities.

The National Youth Administration has a worker-training program. The W. P. A. has a worker-training program. How many other agencies, I am uncertain, but they are numerous. I am willing to appropriate whatever is necessary for this purpose, but I believe it should be centralized under a specific program, all going through one channel, so that we can put our finger on its utilization.

I notice the report is given that in Oklahoma there are 30 cities with 50 schools in operation under this program that have trained some 4,000 workers. I believe that this money should be spent in such institutions as mechanical colleges and technological colleges, where the training is actually prepared for, but I do not know of any 50 schools in 30 cities in Oklahoma where such institutions exist. In fact, I know that they do not exist. So for what purpose are they using the money in these other places?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am, of course, in favor of this appropriation, but I should like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I share very strongly his sentiments about the great number of training courses now available under this or that Government agency.

I call attention to the fact that at page 49 of the hearings on the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill there will be found a detailed statement indicating that there are about 17 of these courses in the general field of training.

I feel with the gentleman that there should be some sort of over-all, authoritative coordination of the entire training picture. It should not be necessary to make so many appropriations for dif-

ferent courses, which may well overlap or duplicate each other.

Mr. BOREN. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. My remark in that connection was not directed as an attack on this particular appropriation, but I hope it is a constructive suggestion to the Appropriations Committee and to pass on to the executive department.

I want to point out that this program as provided in this legislation spends \$300 per person for training each of the men it claims to have under training. No doubt a good portion of that is wisely spent, but I have good reason to believe, from the figures given of 50 schools in 30 cities in my State, and comparable figures for every State of the Union, that there is a percentage of it, in my judgment equal to the amount of deficiency that they ask, that is not wisely spent.

I feel we should put a warning in the hands of such agencies as are engaged in these various purposes that they need not come back for deficiencies until they can show definitely, specifically, and absolutely the wisdom of each dollar that they have spent.

I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will carefully audit each dollar in the future.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know where the gentleman gets his figures, but we were told that the cost of this training program was about \$50 per person. That is on the preemployment trainees. On the so-called refresher courses, or part time course, about \$25 per person. I do not know how the gentleman arrived at his \$300 figure, but that is not the information that was given to the committee, and we do not believe that is correct.

Mr. BOREN. The figure that I took was the total number of people listed in the hearings that have been under training. I simply divided the total appropriation by that total number of trainees, and in simple mathematics it makes \$300 per person. Of course, if they are spending \$50 per person for training and \$250 for administration, that is something worth looking into.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. I want to get this clear.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while the total cost of this program is \$66,000,000, the number that they told us would be trained under it was over 500,000. That means \$130 each. That is quite different from \$300. It is being done under the boards of education of the different local communities and not from Washington. The overhead in Washington is extremely small.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will see from the table on page 2 of the committee report that it runs up to 2,000,000 instead of 500,000, the total number to be ultimately trained.

Mr. TABER. That would divide it down to less than \$40 each.

Mr. BOREN. The divergence in figures offered by the 2 members of this committee indicates uncertainty on the amount spent but I hope the lowest figures that have been brought out here are correct, and I am glad to have this additional information. It may be, of course, that there is an error in my calculation. I am willing to spend whatever money is necessary to adequately train a worker, but I again call to the attention of the committee the fact that there are not 50 schools in 30 cities in Oklahoma that have technological or mechanical organizations set up to train men for the purpose that we are training them for.

I want to say again that the point of my rising is that these many agencies for training should be consolidated so that we can put our finger on what we are spending and how it is being spent. There is great duplication in these various agencies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution today because I have concrete evidence of the fine job that is being done by the United States Department of Education, the State departments of education, and by the local communities in the training of young men for the defense industries of this country.

In 1937 I sponsored and had passed in this House the apprenticeship bill. During the debate on that bill I stated on the floor of this House that if the day ever came that this country was at war, industries would cry for trained mechanics. That day has arrived, and all over this country all the defense industries are crying for trained men and trained women. I stated upon the floor of this House a year ago that we should consider, and consider very well, the training of the women of this country in the defense industries; and that day, too, has arrived.

In my district there are several of these schools training the youth of the country, both under the Department of Education and the National Youth Administration. I know that in my home town during the last 2 years over 1,000 youths of the district were trained and placed in defense industries—in the building of submarines, airplanes, guns; in fact, practically everything having to do with the defense of this country.

I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that possibly there should be a coordination of all these training programs into one. A great deal has been said about the National Youth Administration. Let me tell you what the N. Y. A. has done for the boys of several States in this country who received their preliminary training in their own State and then came to Connecticut to receive their final training and be placed in defense industries. Listen to these figures: From New York City 233 came to Connecticut and received their final training and were placed in war industries; Pennsylvania, 238; West Virginia, 310; Missis-

issippi, 495; Arkansas, 139; Kentucky, 294; Oklahoma, 210; Tennessee, 42; Kansas, 76; Maine, 50; New Hampshire, 6; Missouri, 25. These boys received their preliminary training in their own States and their final training in Connecticut. They were immediately placed in industries making implements for defense.

Only last week the Governor of Connecticut issued a statement to the effect that we are still short several thousand trained workers for the war industries of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I say this is one of the greatest things this country has ever done. It is something that must be done. More attention has got to be paid to the training of the mechanic of the future.

Under the bill that was passed in 1937 45 States adopted the plan, together with Hawaii and Puerto Rico. It was one of the soundest plans ever adopted for the training of the youth of this country. Had we then had the foresight to go into that program extensively and appropriate money to put the program into full effect, today we would not be so short of trained mechanics.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask the gentleman this for the RECORD: Do these young people who are trained by the National Youth Administration under this program receive similar compensation to that paid other workers doing the same work in the defense plants?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think they do.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is the gentleman sure about it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know some of these industries are paying these youngsters for being trained, paying them while they are going to school.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But my question is whether these industries are paying these young people comparable compensation to that paid others doing similar work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes, I understand they are.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to legislation which will be brought before us for consideration in a very short time which will have for its purpose making it possible for our soldier boys wherever they may be located to have the opportunity of voting in the coming elections. Many Members here present will doubtless remember the difficulty we had during the first World War to secure any ballots to send to the men who were in the service. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction on their part, as important legislation was enacted during their absence in which they had no opportunity to express their views.

I hope it will be possible that legislation will be enacted, between now and the time for filing primary papers, whereby the boys in the service may be recorded. I do not think a better present or a better

recognition of their services would be possible than to carry out just that idea.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman has done a service in calling attention to this matter. Does not the gentleman think it is necessary that this legislation be passed very promptly so that there may be time enough to put the machinery in motion in order to have it effective?

Mr. TREADWAY. I suppose there will be great difficulty in reaching portions of our troops, but, nevertheless, every effort should be made on the part of the Government and on the part of the Governors of the States to reach every man to give him the right to vote, certainly at election time, and, if possible, in the primaries of those States where primaries have not yet been held. I agree with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York that this legislation is of primary importance and should be speedily enacted by Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to unduly delay consideration and action on this bill. I feel it is a very important measure and one that should have no opposition from any Member of this body. The proposed deficiency of \$9,000,000 is not a part of the regular appropriation, for the vocational agricultural program with which all of us are, of course, familiar. None of these funds are for the purpose of carrying on that popular worth-while program. The funds asked for in the pending bill do involve training for industry and for that part of industry engaged in the war program.

I deeply regret that I cannot agree in this instance with my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], with whom I am pleased to say I usually agree and for whom I have much respect and admiration. The information I have is that Dr. Studebaker has a most excellent vocational education program in Oklahoma. May I just say here that I have known Mr. J. B. Perky, State supervisor of the Bureau of Vocational Education in Oklahoma, for many years and am familiar with his program. He has done an outstanding job. His program is a real credit to our State, and he has a very splendid loyal organization.

I do not doubt the figures Dr. Studebaker gave our committee with reference to the 50 schools in Oklahoma where youth is now receiving training for defense jobs. Such trained youth are really getting those jobs too.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of this part of the defense program. Dr. Studebaker appeared before our committee, and I am sure members were much impressed by his testimony. He made it plain that he is not trying to take over the N. Y. A., the W. P. A., or any other New Deal agency, as some have suspected. He also gave some information and figures that speak for themselves.

He stated that during World War No. 1 they trained only 60,000 boys and girls altogether for defense jobs. During the present emergency, however, we find that they are training more people in a month now than they trained during all of World War No. 1.

Here are some of the figures he gave the committee: His organization is now training 231,000 plus in trades and industry schools; 179,000 youth are attending evening schools; 240,000 adults are receiving training for defense jobs, so important to speeding up production, which, of course, means the speeding up to the successful conclusion of this war for the very existence of the American way of life.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The table at the back of the report indicates that the current year's production will be nearly 2,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Nearly 2,000,000 altogether. Those figures are impressive and speak for themselves. I am delighted that the gentleman from New York and I agree for once. Seriously this is a very important program, and I hope the pending bill will pass without a single objection from any Member on either side of the aisle of this House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, this resolution making an appropriation of \$9,500,000 to accelerate the program of training of workers for war industries is fully justified in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee. The vocational service training program has done a fine job. It rightfully deserves recognition for the part it has played in helping bring about the great increase in our production of munitions of war. No nation, during times of war or peace, can have a better asset than an abundance of competently trained skilled workers. In my State we are very proud of the program that is being fostered by the Office of Education. Twenty-one cities have vocational training programs which are operated through 24 schools. The program in Tennessee has been successful. I wish that it could be greatly enlarged. I am glad the Appropriations Committee and Congress are so enthusiastically supporting the vocational training program for defense workers. I know that it may be possible at this time, but after the war I hope that the program will not only be continued but that it will be accelerated so that eventually we will have provisions for vocational training in the larger high schools and elementary schools throughout the country.

Experience during recent years indicates that we need increased vocational facilities for the school children of America. The tendency is to specialize in some kind of trade or a vocation. This is a necessary result of the mechanical progress of our Nation. I do not mean to

disparage the value of an ordinary high-school or college education, but I do think that more emphasis should be put upon vocational training. Many boys who have graduated from high school and college would be better off if part of their education had consisted of becoming a skilled technician in some trade or avocation.

This program is requiring the assimilation of much equipment and facilities. The question arises as to what will be done with this equipment when the war is over. I am glad the staff of the Department of Education is giving study to this matter. I hope that they will conclude that provisions should be made for the use of the equipment in elementary and high schools, and that Congress will sustain a continuation of the program by making appropriations so that the equipment in these schools may be put to good use.

I am heartily in favor of the resolution, and I hope that it may be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I realize that vocational education is doing a great good. It is being operated by the Federal Government in conjunction with the States, and in that way we have a dual control over its operations. I believe that the money being spent at this time for the education of the youth of this country is probably money wisely spent. If we do not take much time on many of these bills that come in here, it is because there is unanimity of opinion, and therefore it is not necessary to take time.

However, there are other bills that are being fostered along the line of education that I am not so sure are in that same category, and I believe attention should be called to them before their consideration on the floor of the House. When I read the statement of the Treasury of May 22, I find that we have gone in the red \$16,801,000,000. We have got to put the brakes on some of the spending of this Congress, because we have spent money too lavishly and too freely, and we will find that it will be difficult to put taxes enough on the people to bear the burden.

I call attention to the fact that I am approving the spending of the nine and one-half million dollars provided in this bill, knowing that the results obtained from this program will warrant the expense. But in the very near future we are going to be asked to appropriate more money for the National Youth Administration. The National Youth Administration is spending too much money when compared with the results attained, and that is the point I want to bring to the attention of the House right now.

I know of instances where money has been spent in fabulous sums, and the good obtained from the expenditure of those vast sums of money was not justified. When that bill comes before the House, we want to begin to put the ax on it. We want to know where every dollar of that money will be spent, and we want the results to be in proportion to the amount of money spent.

I am satisfied that the money involved in this bill is the most economical way we can develop the youth of this country for the industries in which they will, no doubt, get jobs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What overlapping is there, if any, between the appropriation and activities covered by this bill and the National Youth Administration?

Mr. RICH. I do not think there is any whatever. I do not think there is any overlapping. One has nothing to do with the other. But the National Youth Administration will come in here asking for money, and I want you to put your finger on every penny of it and know it is going to do the good that somebody will tell us about.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the program in this bill is carried out, why should there be any money appropriated for the National Youth Administration?

Mr. RICH. I do not think so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Neither do I.

Mr. RICH. I think we should eliminate the National Youth Administration altogether and put the money in here where the Federal Board of Education, under Dr. Studebaker and the heads of the educational departments of the various States, will look after it. We will know then that we will get 100 cents value in return to the Federal Government for every dollar we spend.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman on that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this joint resolution now before us which appropriates the sum of \$9,500,000 for the continuance of vocational training for our youths and refresher and supplementary courses for older men. The Appropriations Committee and its distinguished chairman [Mr. CANNON of Missouri] are to be congratulated on their wisdom and foresight in recognizing the necessity for training workers in national defense.

It is particularly gratifying to know that a large part of this appropriation will be expended on refresher and supplementary courses for older men, enabling them to get back into their old trades or making them, by reason of their already acquired mechanical skill, readily adaptable to new trades or new methods.

This resolution is in line with H. R. 4958, introduced by me on June 4, 1941, which would authorize an appropriation for \$10,000,000 for refresher courses in recognized vocational and trade schools for mechanics engaged in trades necessary for national defense.

In this total war there is as great need for trained mechanics as there is for trained soldiers. Congress has not been slow in recognizing that fact. The precision with which this Congress is working and the intelligence and wisdom which it has displayed in the entire war

effort are strikingly exemplified by the fact that this morning we passed the Smaller War Plants Corporation bill which has for its purpose the mobilization and utilization of small business concerns for war and essential civilian production and only a few hours thereafter we have before us this present legislation, House Joint Resolution 316, which will, in part, provide the workers for the small business concerns which we hope will get into war production through the medium of the bill we passed earlier in the day.

If this bill passes, as I expect it will, it will be the means of increasing our war production by increasing the number of skilled mechanics available for such work.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as a school man who has been practically all of his mature life in the classroom or in an administrative capacity in connection with schools, I ought to say something in regard to this appropriation. Like the gentleman from Oklahoma who first spoke here today, I understand the need of restricting overlapping and in safeguarding the expenditure of money even in this splendid cause, but as all of you know, I have many, many times taken the floor of this Chamber to speak in behalf of appropriations for the National Youth Administration and other such educational work.

Now we have before us an appropriation to be used through the Office of Education for this vital war training. I believe that any overlapping has been largely eliminated by voluntary cooperation between the administrators of these agencies. If any still exists, let us deal with it.

I know what has been done in vocational education. Someone has already pointed out here that this is done in connection with local school boards. That I think is the especial merit of this particular plan. The Office of Education has carried on already a splendid piece of work, cooperating as it does with State and local agencies, it reaches into every State and motivates, helps, finances, and actuates the training facilities in almost every school of any importance. It is true in my State, and I am sure it is true in the 47 other States in this Union.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I understand that under the vocational-training program the vocational training for agriculture has reached into practically every school district of the country, but the appropriation under consideration here today is primarily for training men in mechanical work for industry, for defense activities. I wonder whether or not the vocational-training program under the George-Dean Act for training young men in mechanics has reached into every school district of the States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Perhaps it has not reached as far as we should like. I may say that ever since 1916, when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed and appropri-

tions were made under it, there has been cooperation in industrial training. It has been greatly expanded in defense training in recent months. Of course, it takes certain facilities for this training—machine shops and similar specialized equipment and a highly specialized teaching force. This is one reason I do not think we ought to permit duplication in this great training program. One reason I am so solidly 100 percent for the particular work we are supporting here today is that it avails itself of the machine shops and other facilities and trained teaching staffs which have been built up throughout the country since 1916.

Mr. HARE. My inquiry was not for the purpose of offering any criticism, because I am sympathetic with this appropriation, but the point I make is that there is a necessity for the enlargement of the program under the vocational-training program to reach every community in the States, because I know that in my State only two communities have been reached so far.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will gladly join with the gentleman in extending the benefits of this training. However, one of the reasons why I asked for this time is to express my personal satisfaction with the superb address of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in his opening statement on this bill. It is plainly evident that the gentleman from Missouri feels deeply the pernicious and unwarranted attacks upon Congress which have lately been poisoning the public mind. The gentleman from Missouri, in reviewing the timely and worthy acts of the Congress in furthering our preparedness effort, has used the most superlative degree in his descriptive terms. And well may he use superlatives in connection with this greatest of all struggles for survival, for it is the greatest our Nation or the world has ever faced.

No doubt participants in every conflict feel that their struggle is most significant, but even so, one does not need the perspective of history nor the astronomical calculations of mathematics to realize that this is the greatest of all human conflicts and that its outcome for good or bad will reach to the entire world and for uncounted centuries in the future. Therefore, when we discuss it we must use superlative expressions and when we consider the patriotic and worthy efforts of our Government in its attempt to cope properly with a most critical situation, we must use superlative adjectives, because all others fall short. Also if we point out the unpatriotic and pernicious efforts of those who wrongfully belittle Congress and the chosen representatives of the people, we are again called upon to use superlative terms to denounce them.

The gentleman from Missouri is a great student of constitutional liberty and he very rightfully recalls the key-stone position which freedom of speech and of the press hold in our Bill of Rights and in our constitutional framework of liberty. Because of this realization he is all the more competent to denounce the abuse of that freedom by anyone

under the pretext of freedom of speech and of the press. As was once said by a noble spirit, "Oh, liberty, what crimes are committed in Thy name!" So we might properly say today, "Oh, freedom of speech and of the press, what license is committed in thy name!"

As for the proper attitude of the American people toward those agencies now influencing the public mind, whenever they wrongfully strive with diabolical cunning to distort facts so as to belittle Congress and so poison the minds of the people against their chosen representatives, undoubtedly it may safely be assumed that "their sins will find them out." One time in my boyhood in a distant community a minister of the Gospel said concerning a disreputable lawyer:

He has become so bad even his disreputable colleagues were forced to disbar him.

From that remark I assumed that this scoundrel had overplayed his hand among even those of his own kind. Of course, he would have been disbarred much earlier from a bar association of high-minded lawyers. What about these agencies of public expression which, by words through radio or by the printed page, deliberately distort the truth? I think it may safely be assumed, in spite of the fact that so many persons believe firmly every word spoken over radio or appearing in print must be the absolute truth, that enlightened citizens of our country will ultimately see the falsity where it exists.

I believe there are several different kinds of statesmen here in the Nation's Capital, although most of us sent here cannot lay claim to that title. Some are official statesmen, chosen by the people of the various congressional districts or States to represent the people and to speak for the people. Other individuals of this select group are unofficial statesmen, if they properly qualify at all as such, and they may represent even larger constituencies in some cases than do the Members of this body. They may or may not be chosen by their constituents through an election.

I have in mind now certain leaders of large groups of our citizens who are here in Washington to counsel with us duly elected officials toward the proper determination of wise policy in governing the Nation. Among these unofficial statesmen I would classify some outstanding newspaper editors, whether here or at their desks elsewhere, or leading columnists, or widely heard radio commentators, who may not have been chosen by any constituency, but nevertheless represent a more numerous constituency than any Congressman or Senator. Such individuals just mentioned are like watchmen upon a tower. Their responsibility to the people is just as great or even greater than that of any legislative or administrative official.

These unique leaders of thought whom I have called unofficial statesmen may not have taken an oath such as each of us took on assuming our duties here to uphold and support the Constitution of the United States. They may not have subscribed publicly to any code of ethics of

which their profession boasts, but their obligation is measured only by their potential influence. If some of them play "petty politics" or stoop to mean and personal privileges for temporary gain, not only will their decent fellows find them out, but their influence upon their millions of followers will quickly wane. It seems to me that any delegated or self-appointed spokesman stationed in this strategic place who distorts the truth, who belittles the effort of his Government in our greatest hour of trial, is not only crumbling the sand under his own feet, but playing false to his country. We Members of Congress are only a few of those here in a strategic position who need to realize the solemn obligation resting upon us and who need to know that we will be measured now and hereafter accordingly as we measure up to that obligation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the record should be clear as to exactly what this program does. I would judge from the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] that there is perhaps some misunderstanding as to the scope and character of the program this appropriation is intended to implement.

To begin with, there is nothing in common between the program of the National Youth Administration and the program provided under the appropriation which this \$9,500,000 appropriation supplements. I have been asked repeatedly by men on the floor whether or not this is in addition to or in connection with the National Youth Administration. They are entirely separate and distinct programs.

I think the gentleman from Arizona correctly expressed the situation by indicating that we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars since 1916 in the development through Federal aids of a great Nation-wide system of vocational education. The Federal Government has provided funds to aid in the development of vocational educational institutions in the various States. The States that have availed themselves of the provisions of that law have developed modern, fine vocational-training centers operated by State directors of vocational training in connection with the regularly established school programs in the various States.

When the need for the preemployment training and refresher training of men necessary and vital to the war industry became so apparent there was set up in the Office of Education a defense program that was superimposed upon the vocational program of this country. The Congress appropriated fifty-four-million-odd dollars to enable the Office of Education to utilize the facilities of the vocational-school systems of this country.

You would be interested to know that the evidence before our subcommittee in relation to the forthcoming appropriation bill for the Federal Security Agency discloses that in practically all of the communities of the United States where

there are vocational school facilities those facilities are now being operated 24 hours a day training men who come there for refresher courses and training men who come for preemployment courses. This fund is designed to supplement the funds provided in the defense vocational training program by allowing the hiring of teachers and instructors to continue this defense vocational training program on a 24-hour basis. Instead of training just a few hundred thousand people, the program contemplates training under this very appropriation which this joint resolution supplements, over 2,000,000. Now they have no connection whatever with N. Y. A., and while there may be some duplication of service in certain communities and while there may be some overlapping, perhaps, you will have an opportunity to view the program of the N. Y. A. when that bill comes before the Congress. To those people who are interested may I state that all you have to do is to read the Budget message of the President submitting the appropriation for N. Y. A., and you will see that the ax has been administered to that agency very, very radically and materially by the President, and it has been reduced now to a program that is definitely associated with the war effort. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly support this legislation as a very great contribution to the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, the work that has been carried on through money previously appropriated for vocational training has, in my opinion, been about the best-spent money we have had the privilege of appropriating. I think one of the indictments, and probably one of the worst indictments, that has been brought against the educational authorities and the people engaged in the education of the youth of this land is that they have given a little too much of their time to promoting what might be termed "higher education" for the small minority of the youth of this land. The great majority of the young men and women do not have an opportunity to go to college and I have never regarded a man or woman as being educated until they knew how to earn a living.

In my State of North Carolina I have never had to explain, apologize, or even experience one moment of embarrassment over the money spent in this program. One of the outstanding examples of the work being carried on under this program is within a few miles of my home. I have visited it frequently at Newport, N. C. These young men and young women become very much interested in the work and they soon get a vision of being able to do a good job in the particular calling or in the particular field which they select. There is one thing, however, that the States and the Federal Government, in my opinion, must do something about, and that is with respect to the equipment in these shops. As it is at present they have to get their equipment the best way they can, and I dare say 95 percent of the

shops are short on equipment. This means that the students are unable to give the time they would like to give to a particular machine. It further means that they limit their enrollment. But in making this criticism or suggestion, I do so not with any idea of removing any of the laurels already won. I do so realizing that we cannot have everything that we might desire in the shop, but at the same time when we need the skilled worker, if there were some way we could set up the equipment in the shops, we would, at the same time, step up the output of trained men. Just how this can be worked out I would not attempt to give the details, but after visiting many of these shops I find that this is the only criticism expressed.

Of course, we need skilled men, we need trained workmen, and there are private schools over the country now training welders and mechanics of various kinds. They pay quite a bit in tuition and there is work and plenty of material for these private schools.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this program will continue and the enrollment increase in number.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk may read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read House Joint Resolution 316, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes herein set forth, the sum specified, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Education and training, defense workers (national defense): For an additional amount for payments to States, etc. (national defense), fiscal year 1942, for the cost of vocational courses of less than college grade, as provided in paragraph (1) under this caption in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended by the second paragraph under the same caption in title III of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942 (Public Law 528), approved April 28, 1942, \$9,500,000.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I wish to commend the Committee on Appropriations for bringing to us the resolution now before us to add \$9,500,000 to the \$52,400,000 heretofore voted by the Congress to give vocational training to young men and women to equip them for service in our defense plants.

We are now engaged in a great and total war. The facilities of every factory, plant, shop, and mill, and the brains and the hands of all Americans necessary, should be utilized in producing more and more ships, planes, bombers, tanks, guns, shells, clothing, and other supplies and equipment for our armed forces, so that our country and those associated with us may in the near future have complete superiority over the Axis Powers on land and sea and in the air, in order that victory may come at the earliest moment possible and with the least loss of human life.

Some very effective work has been done along these lines already. I have always looked with favor on vocational training.

The hands should be trained as well as the mind.

Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] said that a young man or a young woman is not fully and completely educated unless they have been so trained that they can earn an honest livelihood for themselves. I have long entertained the same views.

In the year 1919 or 1920, I do not recall which, when the Republicans were in control in the House and Senate, I was a member of the Committee on Education and that committee, under the able leadership of Dr. Fess of Ohio, reported a bill, providing for vocational training for those physically handicapped. Its purpose was to take these physically handicapped citizens off of the human scrap heap and train them and make them self-supporting citizens. In an able speech by a certain distinguished Member of the House, the constitutionality of the measure was seriously challenged and the advisability of entering upon such a policy was seriously questioned. It was my pleasure to meet that challenge on the floor. The measure was adopted by the House and later by the Senate and we set out on the policy of vocational training for the physically handicapped throughout the Nation. This policy has been continued through the years and I am happy to say with splendid results. Thousands of boys and girls, men and women, physically handicapped, have been reclaimed and have been and are now self-supporting, self-respected citizens.

The measure before us is strictly a war measure. I have no doubt but what it will greatly contribute to the winning of the war and it affords me real pleasure to give it my whole-hearted support.

I think the resolution should be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this joint resolution close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I would like to have time to ask one question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which will take not over 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield half a minute to the gentleman from New York for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I shall endeavor to propound the question in half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the right to object?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Yes; I am reserving the right to object. I am wondering if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations can throw any light on this subject.

I am informed that last January a conference was held at Baltimore under the aegis of the National Committee on Education and Defense of the United States, Office of Education, which was attended by representatives of many of our leading universities and colleges, and the

topic under discussion was the matter of keeping up an educational program in the colleges during the summer so as to accelerate the education of those students who desire to attend summer school but are financially unable to do so; that the discussion centered around a proposed program of Federal grants-in-aid of those students, both in the fields of vocational and nonvocational education. Mind you, I am 100 percent for this resolution and the only reason I have taken the floor is because of my feeling that we should go further afield. Therefore, I am interested to learn whether any legislation has been proposed or presented to the Committee on Appropriations by the Office of Education in conjunction with the Federal Security Agency for implementing the program tentatively decided on at the Baltimore meeting. I consider this a timely inquiry because the summer sessions of our universities and colleges will be getting under way by the first week in June, and if that aid is to be available, it should come quickly. In my judgment, the accelerating of the education of college students and the utilizing of the splendid facilities of our colleges and universities on a year-around basis would be a real and valuable contribution to our all-out war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I think the gentleman agrees with me that that discussion would properly come under the N. Y. A., which will be before the House shortly, and it is probable that the gentleman will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the chairman in charge of that bill might throw some light on the matter he has in mind. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this resolution close in 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I have not withdrawn my reservation of objection. I would like some explanation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is nothing at all before our committee and nothing in the shape of legislation before the House on the subject, but there will be legislation before the House later on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has reserved the right to object. Until someone demands the regular order, he may continue.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I do not believe I am violating any confidence when I say that I have discussed this question rather fully with key officials of the Office of Education and also with the Federal Security Agency. They both assure me that no effort is being spared to implement the plan for lending a financial helping hand to deserving students who otherwise would be unable to pursue their college educations during the summer months.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am just as interested in the matter as is the gentleman, but it is not germane to this subject or to this bill. I have no doubt the gentleman would like to have it discussed at the time when we have legislation before the House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I think it is quite germane, but I am perfectly content to let the matter rest at this point, in the light of the gentleman's assurances.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making only one observation. That is that for the past several months many of us have been greatly concerned about training young men for entrance into industrial activities and defense industries.

A number of agencies of the Government are training young men for this purpose. I would not have time to go into any great detail. I think probably they are making a very valuable contribution to our defense activities in training young men before actually going to work. However, what I would like to bring to the attention of the House is this: It is extremely important that we have machines, that we have tanks, that we have airplanes of different types, observation, fighting, and bombing planes of every type. It is not only necessary to have these but it is highly important we have someone to operate them and to operate them in the most effective way possible. Being able to handle a plane properly in combat is just as essential as being able to handle efficiently a machine gun or any other implement of war. My thought is that, in addition to the training young men will receive in actually operating planes, there should be a training prior thereto which would enable them to know thoroughly the conditions under which the planes are to be operated; weather conditions; atmospheric conditions; the manner in which different sizes and types of planes will behave under different circumstances and conditions at different heights; aviation mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other matters highly essential for an Army pilot. Of course, practice in flying finally makes the expert, but basic training to begin with would be most valuable, and such information can be obtained before actually going into the Air Corps and prior to entering the pilot-training schools. When young men go into combat they will be compelled to make decisions immediately, and they will want to know their business like knowing the alphabet, because without this they will not be experts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration House Joint Resolution 316 and directed

him to report the same back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the joint resolution be agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution to final passage. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day, I may be permitted to proceed for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the joint resolution just passed may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio and Mr. DELANEY asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

INTEREST RATE ON LAND BANK AND COMMISSIONER LOANS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 485.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous order shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago last week I came to Congress and entered upon my duties in this body in a special session which had been called by President Wilson. Since that time I have voted for every agriculture bill except during the years I was not a Member of the House. Never, though, have I voted for a measure more far-reaching in its importance or which promised to do more for agriculture and the country as a whole than the bill this rule seeks to make in order. Three times this House has expressed itself on this proposition. Those were peacetimes. How much more important is it now that we are at war that we again make possible this aid not only to agriculture but to our country as a whole.

It is not my belief that it is necessary to take any considerable time in calling attention to this rule, nor shall I do so. I do, however, want, Mr. Speaker, to pay a deserved tribute to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], who, during all the years I served with him on the Committee on Agriculture, has rendered such splendid service not only to agriculture but to the country as a whole.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. NELSON. It is with pleasure that I yield to the able Member from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In that connection let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that no man has done more to further rural electrification for the farmers than has the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NELSON. I thank my Mississippi friend, who has for so long been in the forefront of the fight for Rural Electrification Administration. I wish also to express my appreciation of the work of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], who has been instrumental in bringing out this legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield, with pleasure, to my friend and fellow member on the Rules Committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. We on this side have no disposition to fight either the rule or the bill. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture, was it not?

Mr. NELSON. That is true. I was about to make the statement that the bill has the unanimous support of both sides of the aisle; and, thank God, we have no politics when it comes to getting this war job done; this is a part of the war job.

A little while ago I walked over to the Capitol with the chief of the bureau which has to do with the purchasing of all the meat we shall need for our Army. He stressed the importance of the part agriculture must play at this time. Last week I was back in my home State, and

there I found farmers, men and women past the years when they ordinarily work so hard, going on the job with most indomitable enterprise. The farmers of the country, handicapped as they are by the lack of sufficient help and machinery, need to produce all we must have and are going to produce what we need for our boys on the fighting front and what they are going to need after the war is over. This is bound to mean increased cost of production. The seriousness of the situation all the more justifies such legislation as the pending rule seeks to make in order.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I understand the gentleman from Illinois has no request. So, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent there is no opposition to this bill, and in order to expedite the matter I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of paragraph "Twelfth" of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (relating to the $3\frac{1}{2}$ -percent-interest rate on Federal land bank loans), is amended by striking out "occurring within a period of 7 years commencing July 1, 1935," and inserting in lieu thereof "occurring within a period of 9 years commencing July 1, 1935."

(b) The fourth sentence of such paragraph "Twelfth" (relating to the time limit on payments made by the United States to land banks on account of such interest reduction) is amended to read as follows: "No payments shall be made to a bank with respect to any period after June 30, 1944."

Sec. 2. The last paragraph of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act, as amended (relating to reduction in the interest rate on loans by the Land Bank Commissioner), is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the rate of interest on loans made under this section shall not exceed 4 percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 22, 1937, and prior to July 1, 1940, and shall not exceed $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 1, 1940, and prior to July 1, 1944."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, for some time the Committee on Agriculture has been considering legislation, having in mind amending the original act in several instances. However, we finally reported H. R. 7091 at which time we also reported this bill. On account of the emergency it is the unanimous opinion of the members of the committee that we should pass this bill at this time which has for its purpose the extending of the $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent interest rate for 2 additional years.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ROMJUE. The provisions of this bill extends the rate of interest that has been given to this class of loans heretofore, with which I am in entire accord. Personally I think it ought to be permanent legislation but I realize that the chairman is just as much interested in the farming class of people as I am and no one has devoted more interest and time trying to help this class of people than the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina. I want to compliment him on the fine service he has rendered to farmers of this Nation. His judgment on this legislation is entirely in accord with my own.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct as to the provisions of the bill and I want to thank him for the very kind remarks and would like to add that I do not know of any Member of Congress who has served all these years with me that has been more deeply interested in farm legislation and who has rendered more real service in connection with the passage of the many bills that we have considered in behalf of the farmer.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, in 1933 we passed the original bill fixing lower interest on farm mortgages held by Federal farm agencies. This was renewed in 1935, again in 1937, and in 1939. The law expires on the 30th of June of this year, except for the Commissioner's loan provision, which expires May 30.

The interest rates on notes and mortgages given by the farmers to the various farm agencies of the Federal Government will automatically return to the interest specified in the notes and mortgages, unless the bill passes. They have been paying $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent for 8 years, and this bill renews that interest rate for a period of 2 years.

I think the bill should pass as it is written. It is simply a continuation of the present law. The farmers have suffered severely by reason of the war, especially in labor shortage and costs. Their boys have volunteered and have gone to war. It is natural for a farm boy to go to the defense of his country, and I think they are now forming the backbone of the companies and regiments that are today close to the front lines.

There is a further reason for the passage of this measure. The farmers have been paying this rate of interest, and this is no time to raise the interest rate. It will automatically go up unless we pass this bill. I was farming when the other war was on. Farm products were sold in the market for what we could get. We then had a free market. We now have a controlled market, as we have passed a price-control bill. Therefore the farmers are raising their products at fixed prices, but it is costing them more to raise crops by reason of higher prices on everything they need, including labor.

A further reason this bill should pass at the present time is that one of the things which must come out of this war is lower interest rates. We are not going to be able to carry the immense national debt at present rates. It is plain to be

seen that we can carry \$100,000,000,000 at 1½ percent as easily as we could carry \$50,000,000,000 at 3 percent. So there are going to be lower interest rates, and the farmer should now have the advantage of those lower rates.

If the farm-credit agencies could today borrow the money on the market and pay the rates that are now charged, there would be no cost to the Treasury in continuing this law. Some years ago a large number of their bonds were sold at high interest rates. Most of them are not callable until after 1946. The farmers must not pay the penalty.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should pass.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I take this occasion to compliment the gentleman on the matchless service he has rendered the American farmer as a Member of this House. I do not know any Member of the House who has been more faithful to the interests of the poor man and the farmer, regardless of what he has been producing, than the distinguished gentleman from Oregon. We in Montana as well as the people in the gentleman's State are to be congratulated that we have the benefit of his splendid service.

Mr. PIERCE. I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I have written out a statement on this bill and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include that statement and the committee report on the bill.

FEDERAL FARM LOAN INTEREST RATES

The bill under consideration, H. R. 6315, extends for 2 additional years interest-rate provisions of the present act which expires July 1, 1942. That act provides that all who have obtained loans through the Federal land banks, or through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, these latter known as Land Bank Commissioner's loans, are given the continued privilege of paying 3½ percent upon the principal, instead of the interest rates specified in the mortgages. These notes and mortgages bear from 4 to 6, and even 6½ percent.

This law has been on the statute books since 1933 when it was first passed by the Congress, and signed by the President. It then provided for a 4½ percent interest rate. It was designed to help the farmers of this country, not only in fixing a reduced amount of interest they were paying to the Federal Farm Credit agencies, but also in establishing a standard which would make impossible the excessively high farm mortgage interest rates which have been charged, in the past, by some private lending institutions.

After 2 years of operation, the law was re-enacted by the Congress, in 1935, and provided for a 3½ percent interest rate. In 1937, a bill to continue the 3½-percent rate was vetoed by the President. Congress passed the bill over the veto. This was repeated in 1938, when Congress again renewed the act over a Presidential veto. In 1940, the law was renewed for 2 years, with the President's approval. When the Congress passes this bill, H. R. 6315, I believe the President will willingly sign it.

NO TIME TO RAISE FARM INTEREST RATES

It is no time to raise farm interest rates. A country at war must rely upon the farmer for dependable and increased production of the foods and fibers to sustain, not only its own nation and its armies on the battle fronts, but to assure adequate supplies for

its allies. The country is banking on the certainty of the contribution of American farmers. This is an important factor in maintaining hope and strength among the United Nations at war with the Axis. All the democracies are expecting much of American farmers and they will not be disappointed.

No group of producers in the United States has suffered more severely by reason of the Selective Service than have the farmers and stockmen. Their skilled and dependable working forces have been depleted. It is just natural for the strong, sturdy, responsible boy reared on a farm or stock ranch to volunteer for the armed forces of the country. He is inured to hardship. He knows what it is to get up early in the morning and work till late at night, battling with the elements and facing the storms. He loves the land and rushes to the defense of his country and all that he holds dear. Farm volunteers form the backbone of many of the regiments and companies which are today holding the exposed front lines.

Thousands of farmers have written Congressmen about the desperate conditions because the skilled farm workers have gone into the service, or into the war industries where they are earning higher wages than could possibly be paid on the farms. The trained, experienced labor essential to successful production has been drawn off and cannot be easily replaced. It requires experience and skill to produce farm crops. It requires long hours of hard work every day. Dairy farmers have been especially hard hit. Many of them have been forced to dispose of herds, to their own great loss and to the detriment of the food supply of the country. Farmers and their wives are working like slaves, and quite a percentage of farm labor will be done this year by girls and women who do not have the physical strength for the tasks. They will drive the tractors, they will watch the herds, they will milk the cows, they will do their level best.

Farmers have to carry a load of greatly increased operating costs. They spend hours of fruitless effort trying to get equipment and materials for farm machinery and farm storage. Their greatest problem is to meet the excessively high wages which must now be paid for farm labor, in spite of the fact that the Government rigidly fixes ceiling prices for farm produce. A dairy farmer writes me about paying \$90 a month, and board, for a man to milk cows. Think of it. Paying a man on a farm as much as college-trained school teachers are paid, then clamping down on the prices to be paid for the products.

In the face of these facts on farm-labor scarcity and cost and on farm price restrictions, can we hazard permitting an increase in farm interest rates? Farmers are not expecting to make more money from increased production and parity price maintenance. The Secretary of Agriculture has asked them to produce more milk, butter, eggs, hogs, cows, chickens, more fruit and vegetables, and the farmers are responding. They are courageously facing the rapidly multiplying difficulties and problems of production and marketing. Farm problems and crops are so varied that each section has its own peculiar and pressing problems. Those growing fruit and vegetables for canning are dependent upon supplies of scarce materials like tin and sugar. The delays and uncertainties add to production costs.

PARITY PRICES

It is often stated in the press that farmers are enjoying an era of great financial prosperity and of assured income. It is true that times are better than when this administration came into power in 1933—and what a struggle we have had to bring about improved conditions. We have fixed minimum prices for cotton, wheat, peanuts, corn, and tobacco. These prices are controlled by

Government-loan values, which have also been construed to be maximum values. It was right and proper that we should provide Government loans on basic commodities, to the amount of a stipulated percentage of parity. It was the hope of those who supported such legislation that the prices would not be considered maximum prices, but that hope has been dispelled by experience. Rarely are sales made above the loan values provided by law.

The congressional debates and public discussions of parity and the formulas for arriving at and maintaining parity prices have not yet resulted in any clear and just procedure. We have passed a price-control bill, which has immensely complicated the farm-price situation. Congressmen from farm districts have quite generally supported the price-control legislation, but with many misgivings as to the effect of these price ceilings on farmers. It is doubtful if producers will, during this war period, receive in the central markets \$20 for live hogs, though I sold them as high as \$22.50 during World War No. 1. Wheat will never bring \$2.25 a bushel, as it then did. Why? Because there is a ceiling on prices and a rigid price control.

FARM DEBTS NOT YET PAID

In the face of these unalterable facts, can we afford to raise farm interest rates? Is it just and fair? Farmers have not yet been able to pay the debts contracted during the great depression. They are just beginning to emerge from the difficulties of those years. We must not place impossible financial burdens on their shoulders. The passage of this bill will assure continued interest rates which the farmers can meet and pay to the Government and to the banks. Those who would oppose this bill cannot shield themselves behind any true statements about the great farm prosperity assured because of legislated prices for basic commodities, with ceiling prices set for the numerous other farm products. It is true that the lower interest rates have been enjoyed for 8 years now, but the time has not arrived for placing other burdens on farmers.

The present law expires July 1, 1942. Failure to reenact this would cost the American farmers many millions of dollars in higher interest rates to be collected from them by the Federal land banks. It would also enable the insurance companies and investment bankers, which are the most numerous agencies extending farm credit; to collect many more millions than they would have collected had the Government maintained its interest standard.

Less than one-half the loans on farming lands are made through Federal lending agencies. The greater percentage is made by investment bankers, insurance companies, and private lenders. The Federal Government must fix the standard in order to hold high the morale of the farming world. No single act will now be a greater contribution than continuation of the present existing law, fixing at 3½ percent the interest rates the Federal land banks collect on their farm loans.

WHAT DOES THE PRESENT LAW COST THE TREASURY?

The existing law gives the farmer the right to pay 3½ percent interest in lieu of any amount fixed in the notes and mortgages which he gave to the Federal Farm Credit agencies. Estimating the cost of this adjustment is largely a matter of bookkeeping, and transferring of funds. Eight years ago, when we passed the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act which provided for Commissioner's loans and amended the Farm Loan Act, it became necessary to sell some millions of dollars of bonds at a high rate of interest. These bonds are still outstanding and are not all callable until 1946. It is a pity they could not have been refunded. Farmers should not be called upon to pay the high

price of official errors or bad judgment, and of world-wide financial changes.

If the Government could today take up all outstanding bonds and refinance them at present interest rates the passage of the act would entail no cost to the Treasury. Owing to the fact that the Federal land banks have these high-interest-rate bonds outstanding, there is an apparent deficit, which, under the present law, is made up from the Treasury of the United States. A recent statement given me by the Farm Credit Administration is to the effect that the passage of this bill will make certain payments necessary. In 1943, the amounts will be \$25,213,000 to the Federal land banks and \$8,990,000 to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a total of \$34,203,000. In 1944, the probable transfer will be \$23,860,000 to the Federal land banks, and \$8,304,000 to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a total of \$32,164,000.

FUTURE LOWER INTEREST RATES

Students of finance suggest that interest rates will drop still lower because of the necessity of carrying the huge loans piling up to finance the war. It is clear that we can carry \$100,000,000,000 of debt with 1½ percent interest as easily as we could carry \$50,000,000,000 of debt with 3 percent interest. Some say, "Money is like any other commodity, and interest rates depend upon supply and demand." We must admit that the old economic law of supply and demand has been suspended by Executive decree, legislative act, and world-wide upheaval. It no longer affects the prices of wheat, corn, or cotton, and neither will it determine in the days to come the rates of interest which can be charged and collected.

The Federal land banks should certainly sell only short-term bonds, or bonds callable after a short period, in order to protect their borrowers under changed conditions and probable lower interest rates in the future. Facing unalterable facts, our theories will be thrown to the winds. Interest rates will go lower, even if we must again reduce the number of grains of gold in the gold dollar.

At this time when labor is so difficult to obtain and so greatly increased in cost, when every factor entering into farm production results in higher charges, when ceilings have been fixed so costs and returns cannot be balanced, it behooves us to hold farm interest rates on Federal loans through Federal agencies at the present figure.

Undoubtedly the whole Federal Farm Loan Act should be rewritten. Many changes should be made in order to modernize this Federal lending agency. For 2 years the House Committee on Agriculture has held extensive hearings and taken much testimony on the proposed changes. It now appears that we cannot pass a comprehensive bill before July 1, when the present interest rate section expires. I therefore concluded that it would be wise to introduce and press to immediate passage a brief and simple bill extending for 2 years the present provisions on interest rates. This is the bill before us today, H. R. 6315, on which I request your favorable action in order to sustain the courage and assure the financial stability of farmer-borrowers of the Federal system.

[H. Rept. 2133, 77th Cong., 2d sess.]

INTEREST RATE ON LAND-BANK AND COMMISSIONER LOANS

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

STATEMENT

Under existing law, a maximum interest rate of 3½ percent is in effect on farm mortgages made by Federal land banks through

national farm-loan associations, or agents, or purchased from joint-stock land banks by Federal land banks if such mortgages were outstanding in the hands of a Federal land bank on May 12, 1933 (the date of enactment of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933). The same rate applies to loans made by the banks through farm-loan associations since then. Under existing law, that reduced rate terminates on all such mortgages on July 1, 1942. Similarly, under existing law, the so-called Land Bank Commissioner's loans are subject to a maximum 3½ percent interest rate, which expires July 1, 1942.

The Congress has on three previous occasions provided for the extension of the provision for reduced rates above referred to, the last act being Public, 672 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 29, 1940. The purpose of the reported bill is simply to extend the provisions of that act for 2 additional years, or until July 1, 1944.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, section 12, paragraph "Twelfth", first four sentences:

"Twelfth. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph "Second", the rate of interest on any loans on mortgages made through national farm-loan associations or through agents as provided in section 15, or purchased from joint-stock land banks, by any Federal land bank, outstanding on the date this paragraph takes effect or made through national farm-loan associations after such date, shall not exceed 3½ per centum per annum for all interest payable on installment dates [occurring within a period of seven years commencing July 1, 1935] occurring within a period of nine years commencing July 1, 1935; and no payment of the principal portion of any installment of any such loan outstanding on the date of the enactment of the Farm Credit Act of 1935 shall be required prior to July 1, 1938, if the borrower shall not be in default with respect to any other condition or covenant of his mortgage. The foregoing provisions shall apply to loans made by Federal land banks through branches, except that the rates of interest paid for the respective periods above specified shall be one-half of 1 per centum per annum in excess of the rates of interest paid during the corresponding periods by borrowers on mortgage loans made through national farm-loan associations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay each Federal land bank, as soon as practicable after October 1, 1933, and after the end of each quarter thereafter, such amount as the Land Bank Commissioner certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury is equal to the amount by which interest payments, on mortgages held by such bank have been reduced, during the preceding quarter, by reason of this paragraph; but in any case in which the Land Bank Commissioner finds that the amount of interest payable by such bank during any quarter has been reduced by reason of the refinancing of bonds under section 32 of this Act, the amount of the reduction so found shall be deducted from the amount payable to such bank under this paragraph. No payments shall be made to a bank with respect to any period after June 30, [1942] 1944."

Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933:

"REDUCTION OF DEBTS AND REDEMPTION OF FORECLOSED FARMS

"Sec. 32. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to allocate and make available to the Land Bank Commissioner the sum of \$200,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to

be used for the purpose of making loans as hereinafter provided to any farmer, secured by a first or second mortgage upon the whole or any part of the farm property, real or personal, including crops, of the farmer. The amount of the mortgage given by any farmer, together with all prior mortgages or other evidences of indebtedness secured by such farm property of the farmer, shall not exceed 75 per centum of the normal value thereof, as determined upon an appraisal made pursuant to the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; nor shall a loan in excess of \$7,500 be made to any one farmer. For the purposes of this section, farm property may be valued at an amount representing a prudent investment, consistent with community standards and rentals, if (1) the person occupying the property is not entirely dependent upon farm income for his livelihood but receives a part of his income from other dependable sources, and (2) the farm income from the property, together with earnings from other dependable sources ordinarily available in the community to a person operating such property, would be sufficient to support his family, to pay operating expenses and fixed charges, and to discharge the interest and amortization payments on the loan. Every mortgage made under this section shall contain an agreement providing for the repayment of the loan on an amortization plan by means of a fixed number of annual or semiannual installments, sufficient to cover (1) interest on unpaid principal at a rate not to exceed 5 per centum per annum and (2) such payments equal in amount to be applied on principal as will extinguish the debt within an agreed period of not more than ten years, or, in the case of a first or second mortgage secured wholly by real property within an agreed period no greater than that for which loans may be made under the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, from the date the first payment on principal is due: *Provided*, That when in the judgment of the Land Bank Commissioner conditions justify it, any mortgage made under this section may provide that during the first three years the loan is in effect payments of interest only may be required if the borrower shall not be in default with respect to any other condition or covenant of his mortgage. No loan shall be made under this section unless the holder of any prior mortgage or instrument of indebtedness secured by such farm property arranges to the satisfaction of the Land Bank Commissioner to limit his right to proceed against the farmer and such farm property for default in payment of principal. Loans may be made under this section for any of the purposes for which Federal land banks are authorized by law to make loans, and for the following additional purpose, and none other: Refinancing, in connection with proceedings under chapter VIII of the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended, any indebtedness, secured or unsecured, of the farmer, or which is secured by a lien on all or any part of the farm property accepted as security for the loan. The provisions of paragraph "Ninth" of section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (relating to charges to applicants for loans and borrowers from the Federal land banks), shall, so far as practicable, apply to loans made under this section. As used in this section, (1) the term "farmer" means any person who is at the time, or shortly to become, bona fide engaged in farming operations, either personally or through an agent or tenant, or the principal part of whose income is derived from farming operations or livestock raising, and includes a personal representative of a deceased farmer; (2) the term "person" includes an individual or a corporation engaged in the raising of livestock; and (3) the term "corporation" includes any incorporated association; but no such loan shall be made to a corporation (A) unless all the stock of the corporation is owned by individuals themselves person-

ally actually engaged in the raising of livestock on the land to be mortgaged as security for the loan, except in a case where the Land Bank Commissioner permits the loan if at least 75 per centum in value and number of shares of the stock of the corporation is owned by the individuals personally actually so engaged, and (B) unless the owners of at least 75 per centum in value and number of shares of the stock of the corporation assume personal liability for the loan. No loan shall be made to any corporation which is a subsidiary of, or affiliated (either directly or through substantial identity of stock ownership) with a corporation ineligible to procure a loan in the amount applied for. Until June 1, 1942, the Land Bank Commissioner shall, in his name, make loans under this section on behalf of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and may make such loans in cash or in bonds of the corporation, or if acceptable to the borrower, in consolidated farm loan bonds; but no such loans shall be made by him after June 1, 1942, except for the purpose of refinancing loans previously made by him under this section. As much as may be necessary of the assets of the corporation, including the bonds (and proceeds thereof) issued under section 4 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, may be used for the purposes of this section. Any Federal land bank, when duly authorized by the Land Bank Commissioner and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, shall have the power to execute any instrument relating to any mortgage taken to secure a loan made or to be made under this section, or relating to any property included in any such mortgage, or relating to any property acquired by the Land Bank Commissioner and/or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Any such instrument heretofore or hereafter executed on behalf of the Land Bank Commissioner and/or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation by a Federal land bank, through its duly authorized officers, shall be conclusively presumed to have been duly authorized by the Land Bank Commissioner and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the rate of interest on loans made under this section shall not exceed 4 per centum per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 22, 1937, and prior to July 1, 1940, and shall not exceed 3½ per centum per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 1, 1940, and prior to July 1, [1942.] 1944.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last 2 words.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I am correct in stating that at least 80 percent of the farms throughout the Middle West have mortgages on them. Today, although the prices of farm products must remain where they were last year because of having ceilings placed upon them, farm labor has gone up in cost at least 25 percent. Consequently, it is very important that we do not at this time raise the existing rate of interest. The farmer wants to do his part to help win this war, but Congress must help him with a low interest rate, just as Congress has aided industry of all kinds. There surely will be no opposition to this very essential legislation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill and will vote for its passage. I recall very distinctly that in years past the farmer was required to pay from 6 to 7 and

sometimes as high as 8 percent interest, besides a cash commission, to the loan sharks of this country with the result that the farmer lost his farm and the loaning companies became the landlords of the country. If there is any one thing this Congress has done for which the country generally and the farmer in particular ought to be grateful, it is causing the reduced rate of interest to the farmers to the point where they are almost able to get along, providing he gets decent prices for his products.

As far as my experience has gone, I do not believe the farmer can really afford to pay 3½ percent. His cost of living has gone up, his taxes are going up, the cost of his help is going up when he can get any, and the price of everything he is required to buy in the form of machinery is going up.

Further, when the farmer brings to town a product he has to sell, he has to take the other fellow's price for it. He cannot say what he wants. He has to take what he gets, but when he buys a suit of clothes or a piece of machinery he has to pay the other fellow's price for it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I personally would be willing to vote for even a lower rate of interest to the farmer. I know that in my section of the country the farmers, working under the terms of this particular statute, meet their obligations and pay them. These loans are uniformly retired. I do not have the figures regarding the whole country, but I do know that in the State of Louisiana the farmers meet these obligations and meet them with reasonable promptness and satisfaction.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

In the short time I have, I wish to supplement what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] said a few moments ago about the farmers furnishing many of the soldiers of this country. They are doing this at the cost of their own women going out and doing the work. In my own district I hear from many of them, and their wives and daughters are in the fields working, taking the places of the boys gone overseas.

I read this morning to the House that a young man from a little county in Montana of less than 1,000 population, a county of the State of Montana that is almost unknown, was one of the 80 intrepid men who bombed Tokyo, which did more to shock the Japs and bring war home to them than anything that has happened. That is the class of people we have on the farms. They are patriotic. They will make any kind of sacrifice necessary to win this war now that we are in it.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. First, let me congratulate the gentleman. I have observed the gentleman in my experience

here to be always interested in the farmers. He has always advocated a low rate of interest for farmers. I believe in giving a man flowers while he lives.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. I support this bill. Certainly this piece of legislation is far-sighted. I hold that the 3½ percent rate of interest might well be reduced.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It might even be dropped to 2 percent. The big merchants of the country get their money from the big banks at a rate as low as 1½ or even 1 percent. There is no doubt but what land is the best security for the repayment of money that we have. There has been very little loss incurred by the Federal land banks in connection with our loans to farmers. No doubt this is true largely because of the rate of interest the farmers are now paying. Thanks to the Congress that the big eastern newspapers and periodicals are belittling and defaming.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very easy to support this bill because I have introduced and urged the enactment of similar bills at each regular session of the Congress since I began my service in the House. In fact, my first speech in this chamber was in support of a bill of this character.

The bill which I introduced at the start of the present session—H. R. 6347—proposes—

To extend for 5 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans.

My bill and the bill now under consideration are identical except that mine proposes to extend the time for 5 years instead of 2 years. There is something to be said for the longer period.

As I have stated on other occasions, the business of farming involves many fixed expenses. Taxes are a fixed charge; insurance is another; depreciation is a third. In addition interest on loans is a cost which hangs over the head of many a farmer.

These costs go on from day to day; they accumulate when the farmer works and when he sleeps, whether his crops are good or poor. To pay these expenses from year to year and other operating expenses as well is no small responsibility for the man who tills the soil. The risks attendant upon farming are great. Whatever relief the farmer can get from the uncertainties of his business will remove some wrinkles from his brow. The 5-year period would enable him to make relatively long-term plans insofar as his interest cost is concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, I shall support this bill. And, in doing so, I do not maintain that the enactment of this measure will solve the problems of agriculture. I do contend, however, that it will contribute something to the solution.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. As I understand, it extends the time for 2 years for which no more than 3½ percent interest can be charged on the Federal land-bank loans and the

Land Commission loans. Is not that right, Governor PIERCE?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes; on both groups of loans.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has been very well said here that perhaps the farmers of this country will be hit by the war harder than almost any other group. Their sons are being taken from the farms to enter the armed forces of this country in great numbers, the cost of labor has greatly increased, and the cost of things they must buy have increased. They will receive much less for their wheat, corn, hogs, beef, and other products than they received in the last war. Not only the fathers, but the mothers and the sisters, must join in this great production effort in order to produce enough food to feed the country and our armed forces. They must rise early in the morning and work until late at night. It is a big job and a hard task.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say that I am in favor of this legislation? I have always been in favor of low interest rates to the farmer, because I believe that is one way by which we can make a real contribution to his welfare. While I have the floor I want to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky not only for his splendid and effective service to the farmers, but also his able service to our country as well. I believe in so doing I voice the sentiments of everyone in this House.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank my friend for his words of commendation. I am pleased to know that our distinguished leader on the minority side is heartily in favor of this desirable legislation. I have always found our leader working for the best interests of the farmer and the common people and for those measures which will best serve, in his honest opinion, the welfare of our country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman from Kentucky might point out, in mentioning the effort being put forth by the farmers of America to help win this war, that the farmers of our section of the United States are actually working about 80 hours a week. A survey shows that the average number of hours put in each week by the average farmer in the Middle West is 80.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; that is true, and we must encourage them and help them to carry the tremendous load they are now carrying and will continue to carry throughout the war.

The farmers of my district and my State, Republicans and Democrats, and farm organizations, have urged me to support this bill. I have not received a single word of opposition to it, and I am very happy to stand here and urge, as I believe it will, the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Speaker, we now have under consideration H. R. 6315, the laudable purpose of which is to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. I shall support this measure because I think it is in the interest of national defense and in furtherance of our war efforts and as a matter of justice to the farmers of this country. Many of those who will be benefited, in fact, most of those who will be benefited by this measure, already have loans on their farms, and unless this measure is passed the increased rate on those loans may be advanced beyond the 3½ percent that they now carry.

This is no time to put an additional financial burden upon the farmers. Down in my country they have this expression with respect to the hours that a farmer works—he works from “can’t till can’t”—from before daylight until after dark. He gets up before day and he begins his day’s work before the day is begun, and his work is not finished until the sun has gone down and the shades of night have enveloped him, his farm, and his home. He never quits. He goes on in his partnership with the forces of Nature and his efforts are as unbroken and unceasing as is the procession of the seasons and the equinoxes, and therefore we ought to do all we can to encourage him in this all-out effort that he has not only heretofore made, but is now making. In addition to this, he is presented with a labor problem that has no solution, because I see from reading the pronouncements of the authorities that there is to be no special deferment of the farm boys. They are being inducted into the Army just as other boys. I know that they are being inducted at such a rate as makes it very difficult for the farmer to carry on his work. All this talk about just picking up labor here and there and putting it out on the farm is just a lot of hooey. Unless a boy is raised on the farm and knows which end of a mule to hook to the plow or a harrow or any other agricultural, horse-drawn vehicle, he is not of much benefit to a farmer. He would be as apt to hitch the head of the horse to the plow as the proper end of the horse, as the case may be. Not only that, but the farmer has additional hazards, he is up against the hazard of dry weather and of too much rain, so that we ought to do all we can for him, and I am glad to range myself with the membership of this House in support of this necessary and proper piece of legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are at least three very important reasons why the prevailing 3½ percent interest rate for farm loans should be renewed for the 2-year period asked in the present bill.

First. Three and one-half percent interest is most assuredly a high enough

rate of interest as long as banks pay but 1 to 2 percent on savings deposits. Land is the basis of all wealth and the reason the United States is a great country is because it has a large area of rich, productive fertile land which is the foundation of the wealth of the country.

Second. The President has asked that a ceiling of parity be established for farm products. There can then be no valid reason for raising the farmers’ costs of production by raising his interest rate at this time.

Third. The continuation of the 3½ percent interest rate will indicate to the farmer that no attempt is being made to disturb his production costs by causing him to pay larger interest rates. In other words, it will create a much better feeling in the country if we maintain the present interest rates than it would if we used the war as an excuse for raising these interest rates. I think, then, from the administration’s own standpoint, it would be most desirable to extend the prevailing rate for the 2 years.

During the present session, we have had very extensive hearings on the administration’s proposal to enact rather comprehensive Federal loan legislation. In the main, it should be acceptable to the farmers and for the public welfare but it is doubtful if this is the opportune time to bring out such controversial legislation. If the proposed administration legislation was passed as presented with its proposed increased interest rates, I doubt if we would be making any contribution to unity or to the public welfare at this time. There is not any valid reason why we should not adopt a revised Federal loan program. It should be one that would give the borrower the advantage of a long-term agreement. We would not have this question of interest rates coming up every year or two. This, however, does not seem to be the desirable time for this action.

While it was rumored in the Committee that the President would veto this bill, I call your attention to the fact that he did not veto similar legislation 2 years ago. I have enough confidence in the President to feel that he appreciates the agricultural situation sufficiently to support the present bill.

There should be no politics to this legislation and none should be injected. I hope some of our friends will be more considerate of this fact in the future than they have in the past.

In conclusion, let me repeat that, purely from the administration viewpoint, I sincerely think it is for the best interest of our country, the public, and the farmers, that this bill be passed without a dissenting voice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Unless this bill is passed before June 30, would not the interest rate automatically increase from 3½ percent to what figure?

Mr. MURRAY. As I understand it, the Commissioner loans would increase on June 1 and would go to 5 percent normally, and some of the Federal loans would go as high as 6 percent—old loans.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The enactment of this bill before June 1 holds all loans, both commissioner and regular loans, first mortgage loans, at 3½ percent?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know any reason on earth why the American farmer should pay a higher rate of interest for the money that he uses in his capital structure than American industry is forced to pay for the use of credit and money used in its capital structure?

Mr. MURRAY. Coming from a rural section, perhaps I am somewhat prejudiced in that respect. Of course, what makes this a great country is that we have a large area of rich, fertile, productive land. That provides the safest place in the world to invest money, and the farmer is entitled to money as cheaply as any other group.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think we can set aside all points of patriotism and all points of long hours of labor, and put it on the sole proposition that the American farmer is entitled to credit at as low a cost in the form of interest as any other part of American industry, and that is where I stand on this thing first, last, and all the time.

Mr. MURRAY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the Farm Tenant Act enables the tenant farmer to buy farms provided that loans be made at 1½ percent interest, did it not?

Mr. MURRAY. I think that is something we might very well take up after the emergency. It is 3 percent. We have had 100-percent loans at 3 percent, and there have been 75-percent loans at 4 percent, and 50-percent loans at 3½. At some future time this whole problem should be solved.

Mr. ENGEL. And what interest do the banks demand on loans to T. V. A.?

Mr. MURRAY. I think the gentleman ought to be able to answer that himself. He has made an exhaustive study of these expenses as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. I am not an authority on that.

Mr. MURRAY. I will answer the question by saying that there are 100-percent loans at 3 percent and 75-percent loans at 4 percent, and 50-percent loans at 3½ percent. The amount of this money used on these tenant loans is so small in comparison to the total volume of farm mortgages that it is of little consequence because we have never appropriated very much money for that purpose.

I do think that fundamental changes in Federal farm loans should be made, but I think it should come when we have more time to consider it than we have at this time.

Mr. ENGEL. I am not arguing that the interest rate on the tenant farms should be increased, but I am arguing that reducing this rate to 3½ percent is not unreasonable.

Mr. MURRAY. I think everyone will admit that they should be the same.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not this bill do the same as a bill passed in the Seventy-fifth Congress and in the Seventy-sixth Congress, holding the rate to 3½ percent?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. This is the fourth time it has been extended—1937, 1938, 1940, and 1942.

Mr. MURDOCK. In view of the fact that Congress, by a large majority, has passed this legislation, and even passed it over a veto, does not the gentleman think that in time of war there is all the more reason for it?

Mr. MURRAY. I should think so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell at the Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa., on May 14, 1942, when General Somervell was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of military science.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, or one of the same purpose, has been passed at four previous sessions of Congress. Two years ago it was vetoed by the President, but it was passed over the veto. Through these measures Congress has declared a policy of fair play to the farmers in the matter of interest rates. That declaration has been, and still is, that agriculture shall not pay the previous high rates on land bank and Commissioner loans while business and industry, as well as the Government, are obtaining loans in billions at the lowest rates in history.

Recently there has been passed by Congress a measure authorizing an increase of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by \$5,000,000,000. There have been loaned and expended by that corporation more than \$12,000,000,000. Billions have been loaned to South American and other countries to bring them into alignment on a program against the Axis Powers. The total of land bank and Land Commissioner loans is even less than the loans to foreign countries.

There is every justification for this measure. It merely continues the declared policy of Congress by preventing an increase of interest rates on farm loans. It serves to bring some encouragement to farmers who are engaged in the greatest task ever imposed upon the agriculture of any country—that of food and fiber production, which is essential to winning the war. The response of the farmers to that demand has been prompt and patriotic. Now our farmers are feeding our own and millions of people in our Allied nations, and adding to their production from day to day. "Food will win the war," and our agriculture battle line is being augmented daily.

The draw-backs under which the farmers are laboring can scarcely be estimated by those who are not from farming communities. In the short space of 18

months there have gone from the farms over 750,000 young men to serve in the Army and Navy. Many of them now are on foreign battle fronts, while those of their farm homes take over their work and carry on in their absence. More than 2,000,000 farm people have been called into war industries. More young men are going into our armed forces day by day as the war program calls for still larger numbers for munition and equipment factories. Daily the burdens of the farm become more difficult as the shortage of labor and lack of facilities grow more acute.

A recent survey in Wisconsin reveals that the farmers there are working an average of over 13 hours per day, or from 80 to 90 hours per week. There is no rest, no let-up, no sit-down strikes on the farm. The increased production for our own population and that of Europe and China is evidenced by daily reports. Our farmers are feeding our fighting forces at home and abroad, and not a complaint comes as to quantity and quality.

There are many aspects of the agriculture situation which are not under consideration in the discussion of this measure. There are other problems to be taken up and solved. But a unanimous vote on this bill will bring encouragement to those on the farms who work as they wait that Congress is not unmindful of what they are doing to win the war.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that North Dakota is primarily an agricultural State, which consists of 73,897 farms with total value of \$489,973,948, according to the 1940 census. The crop harvested and marketed for 1940 was valued at \$127,675,000.

Since the administration seems set on keeping the price of wheat below parity, I think it would be very unwise for the administration to enact any legislation that would require the farmers of my State to pay a higher interest rate. We have suffered for several years from low agricultural prices as well as drought, and our farmers are just beginning to get on their feet.

I am very much in favor of this legislation to continue the 3½ percent interest rate on farm loans for another 2 years. In checking over the old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, I find that this is the fourth time that this extension has been presented to Congress. I was pleased to note that during the times that the interest-rate question has been considered that only four Republicans opposed the extension the first year and only two Republicans the second year, and none the last time. As long as the banks are only paying 1 to 2 percent on savings deposits, I am sure that a 3½ percent interest rate is sufficiently high, and I hope that this bill can be passed unanimously.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address by the majority leader, Hon.

JOHN W. McCORMACK, at the commencement exercises of Staley College in Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill to continue the 3½ percent interest rate for the next 2 years, although I realize that there is some question about it receiving final approval by the President.

All of us who are members of the Committee on Agriculture realize the importance and necessity of securing some permanent legislation that will strengthen the Federal land-bank associations and increase the efficiency of the cooperative Federal Land Bank System. I am anxious to see it placed on a sound self-sustaining basis so that it will be able to serve the agricultural credit needs of the country with interest rates comparable to those accorded other industries. Federal subsidies cannot be expected to continue indefinitely and it is hoped that some agreement can be reached soon that will establish a permanent policy with respect to the operation of the Federal Land Bank System. Our Committee on Agriculture has spent many months during the last 2 years in an effort to reach some agreement on this very controversial subject. Because of the lack of accord on permanent legislation, this continuing revolution is necessary until some agreement can be reached on the fundamental issues involved in the permanent legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. There was no controversy, however, in the committee in regard to this bill? It was a unanimous report on this bill?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct on that. We would like to have this rate continued. But within the next 2 years it is necessary to work out some permanent legislation pertaining to the Federal Land Bank System.

The committee, in general, has agreed on the principle that the interest rate charged should be 1½ percent above the cost of money, which would be sufficient to cover costs of operation.

We are in disagreement on the proposal to eliminate the stock ownership which many feel would destroy the cooperative features of the Federal Land Bank System.

Just a word about the \$500,000,000 of high-interest-rate Federal land-bank bonds that are held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. I think it is highly desirable that these bonds be refinanced so that the savings of approximately \$30,000,000 can be passed on to the Federal land banks. If those savings are passed on to the Federal land banks they may be reflected in reduction of interest to the borrowers or in dividends.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that there has been very little loss, if any, on

the part of loans that have been made to the farmers throughout the country, either by the Federal land bank or through the Commissioner loans?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The Federal Land Bank System has a very good record as a loaning institution, considering the plight of its borrowers during the depression.

I believe the cost of operation on the Federal land-bank loans run between 1 and 1½ percent. On the Land Bank Commissioner loans the cost of operation and the losses sustained are relatively higher because in these cases loans are made up to 75 percent of the value; whereas Federal land-bank loans are 50 percent of the value of the land.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think there should be any misunderstanding. The payments have picked up with the increase in the income of the farmers the past year. Prior to that time there were a good many delinquencies.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. The farm borrowers of this country will pay their debts if they are able to do so. The prices they are now receiving for their products are sufficient to enable them to pay their interest.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very encouraging to we folks from Iowa and the other great agricultural States to see so much harmony in favor of the continuance of a 3½-percent interest rate on Federal farm loans, and to know there has not been a dissenting speech made against this bill. I know it will also be most encouraging to the farmers who have these loans, who number thousands upon thousands all over this great land. Will say here that I have not received a single letter in opposition to this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that many farmers of Iowa and the Middle West will lose their farms if this bill is not passed, thereby being forced back to the old high interest rate on farm loans?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Iowa is right; naturally sooner or later that is exactly what would happen; it did happen in thousands of cases a few years back. Right now, of course, they are getting along pretty well, although everything they buy is up, and their prices are held down by the ceilings placed on farm products, the farmers' sons are leaving to serve their country, and they are losing a lot of their good hired help which means they have to hire replacement help at increased wages and often less efficient. Farming is an art these days, you must know the game to make it go. Again I say I am pleased at the reception this bill is receiving by Representatives from every section of the

United States of America, and I know the people of the agricultural States, and the people of the greatest agricultural State—Iowa—will be highly pleased to know that such harmony exists in the House of Representatives in their favor on this bill to continue the present interest rate on Federal farm loans.

I thank you, my colleagues, in behalf of the farmers and the people of my district and State.

(Mr. GRANT of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Lafayette Advertiser.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in a Rockland County newspaper in reference to our former Postmaster General, Jim Farley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WIRE-TAPPING BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 487.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of the prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous order shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the so-called wire-tap-

ping bill. We just passed a Treasury-tapping bill, but this is a wire-tapping bill.

The bill is approved and asked for by the Attorney General, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy. I am very pleased to follow the recommendations of the Attorney General whom I regard as one of the best and most efficient officials that has served the Government during my long service. I feel that during the short period that he has been in office he has proven himself a man of exceptional ability and is rendering a real, valuable service to the country. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the bill on the part of the labor organizations as there was last year on a similar bill. I believe there is no opposition on the part of anyone, because the Judiciary Committee reported the bill unanimously and there is a general demand for the early passage of the legislation. I will not, therefore, take any more time with this exception. I cannot resist calling attention to some of the speeches made on the bill just passed, a bill which by the way again aids the farmers by enabling them to obtain money at 3½ percent interest, whereas formerly they were obliged to pay 6, 7, and 8 percent. Some gentlemen stated that farmers are patriotic, that they enlist. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the cities are also patriotic. And why should not everyone be patriotic and do everything in his power to aid the cause of our great Nation; the greatest country, the best country in the world? So they are not entitled to any special credit. I believe every American should do his part at this time, and I hope to God they will continue to do as many have done in the past.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield for a question about the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand the bill correctly, it limits the operation for the period of the war.

Mr. SABATH. That is all, and 6 months after the war. The committee has eliminated some of the objectionable features that were in the bills previously submitted by that committee.

So, having expressed my views as to the loyalty and patriotism of the farmers, I hope they will also appreciate and recognize what has been done for them in the last 10 years, and that they will continue to appreciate it. I want to congratulate them upon voting solidly for the last bill. I know they will do likewise on this patriotic measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, while we are congratulating, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee on his change of heart with reference to this wire-tapping proposal which he now designates as a patriotic bill. I call attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1941, when this same subject matter was

before the House. When we are talking about votes back yonder and votes today, and when we are making comparisons, may I express the hope that those who are making the comparison will inspect that RECORD of June 30, 1941, with reference to the wire-tapping bill which the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States at that time sponsored and demanded as an emergency defense measure. I think the President called it an unlimited emergency at that time.

I was one of those who went down to defeat fighting for that bill which the President of the United States and the Attorney General said was necessary in the national defense effort. This bill is just belated, but why talk about that? There was honest difference of opinion then, just the same as there was on other matters of policy. There is not room for such differences now. Our war policy is fixed and definite. I call attention also to the report of the committee filed with this bill. It is a splendid report. It is clear, it is concise, it goes further than most reports, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], its author. In a few words it tells of the necessity for the bill, and it explains fully the operation of the bill.

This report should be a part of the record of this debate, and I quote from it as follows:

This measure is in general essence a war measure—effective only until 6 months after the termination of the war or until sooner terminated by the President or by Congress. It does not diminish the present power of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Military and Naval Intelligence services to intercept communications. It is intended to make admissible in evidence information with respect to the offenses referred to which may be obtained by wire tapping, notwithstanding the provisions of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934. That section provides that no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the same.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The resolution authorizes the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Military Intelligence Division, and the Office of Naval Intelligence, in the conduct of investigations, to ascertain, prevent, or frustrate any interference or any attempts or plans for interference with the national security and defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, violations of the act requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals, violations of the act requiring the registration of organizations carrying on certain activities within the United States, or in any other manner, to require that telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications and copies or records thereof be disclosed and delivered to any authorized agent of such agencies, without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103).

Telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications or copies or records thereof may only be required where the agency secures approval of the head of the agency or the officers or official designated by him. Approval may be given only when there is reasonable ground to believe that a violation of a law referred to in the resolution may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed or the national safety is otherwise threatened.

Section 2 requires compliance with the request of a duly authorized person for the disclosure and surrender of a telegram, cablegram, radiogram, or other wire or radio communication.

Section 3 prohibits divulging, publishing, or using information obtained under the resolution except for the specified purposes.

Section 4 makes admissible in evidence in prosecutions for the offenses mentioned in the resolution, and only therein, information obtained by intercepting, listening in on, or recording communications.

Section 5 prescribes the penalty for a violation of any of the provisions, of a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

Section 6 is the usual separability provision and section 7 defines "person."

Section 8 provides for the effective period, during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

REPORT CONCERNING PEARL HARBOR

Authority to require disclosure and delivery of telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications was referred to in the report on the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor filed by the Commission headed by Justice Owen J. Roberts. The report contained the following finding of fact:

"It was believed that the center of Japanese espionage in Hawaii was the Japanese consulate at Honolulu. It has been discovered that the Japanese consul sent to and received from Tokyo in his own and other names many messages on commercial radio circuits. This activity greatly increased toward December 7, 1941. The contents of these messages, if it could have been learned, might have furnished valuable information. In view of the peaceful relations with Japan, and the consequent restrictions on the activities of the investigation agencies, they were unable prior to December 7 to obtain and examine messages transmitted through commercial channels by the Japanese consul, or by persons acting for him."

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Supreme Court in *Olmstead v. United States* (277 U. S. 438), held in 1928 that the tapping of telephone and telegraph wires by law-enforcement officers was not violative of the provisions of the fourth amendment relating to searches and seizures, in view of the fact that it did not involve a physical invasion of anyone's premises.

In *Nardone v. United States* (302 U. S. 379), the Supreme Court held that the Government's introduction of transcripts and recordings of intercepted interstate messages in the trial of a criminal case constituted a divulgence of such messages contrary to the terms of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934.

In *Weiss v. United States* (308 U. S. 321), intrastate telephone communications were intercepted by Federal agents, their contents were divulged to certain of the defendants, and, as a result, these defendants confessed and agreed to turn State's evidence. They were permitted to testify to the contents of the messages. The Court held that the interdiction of the statute extended to the interception and divulgence of intrastate as well as interstate messages. It denied the Government's claim that the witnesses' testifying to the contents of the messages amounted to an authorization by them, as senders, of the divulgence of the communications within the meaning of the statute.

It was claimed in the second *Nardone* case, *Nardone v. United States* (308 U. S. 338), that unlawfully intercepted messages had been used to obtain evidence against the senders, and that such use, and the introduction of the evidence so obtained, over the objection

of the senders, who were defendants, constituted a violation of the purpose and policy of the statute. The Court held that if the facts sustained the claim the evidence should have been excluded.

On April 27, 1942, the Supreme Court rendered two decisions bearing upon section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934:

Goldman against United States involved a conviction for conspiracy to violate section 29 (b) (5) of the Bankruptcy Act by receiving, or attempting to obtain, money for acting, or forbearing to act, in a bankruptcy proceeding. At night access was obtained to the office of one Shulman and to an adjoining room, and a dictaphone was installed in a small aperture in the partition wall with a wire to be attached to earphones extending into the adjoining office. The dictaphone would not work but the investigators had with them a detectaphone having a receiver so delicate as, when placed against the partition wall, to pick up sound waves originating in Shulman's office, and means for amplifying and hearing them. With this apparatus the Federal agents overheard, and the stenographer transcribed, portions of conversations, and also heard what Shulman said when talking over the telephone from his office. Objection was made to the evidence that its receipt violated the fourth amendment of the Constitution and, as respects Shulman's talk into the telephone receiver, violated also section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934.

The Court held (1) that the overhearing and divulgence of what Shulman said into a telephone receiver was not a violation of section 605:

"The listening in the next room to the words of Shulman as he talked into the telephone receiver was no more the interception of a wire communication, within the meaning of the act, than would have been the overhearing of the conversation by one sitting in the same room, (2) that what was heard by the use of the detectaphone was not made illegal by trespass or unlawful entry, and (3) that the use of the detectaphone by Government agents was not a violation of the fourth amendment."

On this latter point the Court said relative to drawing a distinction between the *Olmstead* case and the present one:

"We think, however, the distinction is too nice for practical application of the constitutional guarantee and no reasonable or logical distinction can be drawn between what Federal agents did in the present case and State officers did in the *Olmstead* case."

The Court expressly declined to overrule the *Olmstead* case.

Goldstein et al. v. United States involved the alleged violation of section 605 of the Communications Act by the admission of testimony in a Federal criminal trial. Petitioners and others were indicted under the mail fraud and conspiracy statutes. The alleged scheme was to defraud insurance companies by presenting false claims for disability benefits. The principal subject of contention was the prospective testimony of Messman and Garrow, alleged coconspirators who, the petitioners asserted, had confessed and turned State's evidence because they had been confronted with intercepted telephone messages. Messman and Garrow were parties to these messages, or some of them, but the petitioners were not.

The Court stated the principal question:

"Assuming the witnesses' testimony was induced by divulging to them the contents of intercepted telephone messages, was the admission of this testimony erroneous? We hold that it was not."

The Court also stated:

"The question now to be decided is whether we shall extend the sanction for violation of the Communications Act so as to make available to one not a party to the intercepted communication the objection that its use outside the courtroom, and prior to the

trial, induced evidence which, except for that use, would be admissible.

"No court has ever gone so far in applying the implied sanction for violation of the fourth amendment. While this Court has never been called upon to decide the point, the Federal courts in numerous cases, and with unanimity, have denied standing to one not the victim of an unconstitutional search and seizure to object to the introduction in evidence of that which was seized. A fortiori the same rule should apply to the introduction of evidence induced by the use or disclosure thereof to a witness other than the victim of the seizure. We think no broader sanction should be imposed upon the Government in respect of violations of the Communications Act. The court below was of the view that a divulgence of the intercepted messages might lawfully be made with the consent of the sender, and we agree. The court further thought that, as the sender might make such divulgence lawful by his consent, none but he was intended to be protected against divulgence by the statute. Again we agree.

"The petitioners, however, point out that the statute also forbids the use of an unlawfully intercepted message, or any information therein contained, by any person for his own benefit or the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and they say that the Government officials violated the act by using the messages and the information they contained, to induce the senders' confessions and testimony. They urge that such use is forbidden by the act and that they have standing to object to the introduction of the evidence thus obtained. The Government answers that this provision of the act was not intended to reach the use of the contents of the messages by Federal officers for obtaining evidence but was meant to prevent use for the personal advantage or benefit of the user. We have no occasion to determine the soundness of the Government's argument.

"We are of opinion that even though the use made of the communications by the prosecuting officers to induce the parties to them to testify were held a violation of the statute, this would not render the testimony so procured inadmissible against a person not a party to the message. This is the settled common-law rule. There was no use at the trial of the intercepted communications, or of any information they contained as such. If such use as occurred here is a violation of the act, the statute itself imposes a sanction."

None of us favor wire tapping as a general practice and on all occasions. I expressed my views in this particular in the debate on June 30 last, and I shall not repeat. On that occasion I was severely criticized because I gave, as one of my reasons for supporting the bill, the fact that it was demanded by the President of the United States, by the Attorney General of the United States, and by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as an emergency measure in the preparation and safeguarding of our national defense. I supported the bill then because the reasons for its enactment were just as cogent as they are today.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman, I presume, received letters in opposition to the former wire-tapping bill from certain labor-union leaders and from the Communists, did he not? They were both opposed to that bill?

Mr. MICHENER. We went further. The Committee on the Judiciary held very extensive hearings. I show you the

volume—hundreds of pages. We heard all those people for and against the wire-tapping bill at that time. We have held additional hearings. The subcommittee has held additional hearings on the present bill and the opposition that largely predominated at that time does not obtain today.

All of the liberal groups that opposed the bill at that time realize that this is a war measure and that we are at war. It does not make any difference whose war it was, it is our war now, and it is the duty of every patriotic American citizen to place his shoulder to the wheel and do everything within his power to bring this war to the earliest successful conclusion with the least sacrifice of blood and treasure possible.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOTT. At the time the former wire-tapping bill was up for consideration, and it was opposed by the Communists and certain labor unions, was not the purpose of it at that time to try to overcome subversive activities that were in operation for the purpose of stopping our war preparation effort then?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; but I will not discuss that. That is water over the dam. Today we are faced with a different condition.

None of us want to give up any of his cherished liberties and freedoms, enjoyed because we are a free people. In the present type of war, however, we must think in prospect. It is necessary that we yield power to the President, that we forego privileges, and that we surrender rights momentarily in order that we may enjoy these same things in perpetuity after peace comes to us again. The big job we have today is to win this war, and that will be followed by the big job of regaining these freedoms after the necessity for yielding them up has ceased. I cannot imagine a Member of the House taking the floor and opposing this bill. It just will not happen. Quite a contrast from June 30, 1941. Yet some of these same persons who were opposing the President's demand for emergency defense legislation then are now wont to criticize others for not going along with the things they wanted, and which the President also desired, before Pearl Harbor.

Comparisons are usually odious. It little behoves any of us to harp on what happened before Pearl Harbor. In the wire-tapping instance I was an ardent supporter of what the President wanted because I believed, and we now know, that his demand at that time was essential. The majority of the House, however, felt otherwise, and many of those who had ardently supported the President in some other demand violently opposed him in this matter. Undoubtedly all acted in good faith. All used their own best judgment in behalf of what they thought was for the best interest of the country. Someone was wrong, but criticism and fault finding will not help win the war at this time. When war was declared we started from there and undoubtedly there

is general unity of purpose. This war is our joint venture and will only be successfully terminated by joint, unhampered, and cooperative action. The I-told-you-so attitude hinders rather than helps the war effort, and the sooner our people cease talking about what has been and devote all their time and effort to what is going to be and what must be the sooner will this dreadful scourge of war pass from us.

The committee report, which I have quoted, explains just what this bill does. It is some different than the bill which was defeated on June 30. That bill extended the right to tap wires where espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, and extortion were involved. In no other instance did that bill permit wire tapping and the use of the evidence obtained thereby. The bill before us is broader, more far-reaching, and covers much more territory than the defeated bill. It authorizes the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Military Intelligence Division, and the Office of Naval Intelligence to use wire tapping in the detection of treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, and in numerous other instances where the national defense is concerned. It would be a very drastic law under any excepting war conditions. Be it remembered, however, that this is purely a war measure, and can be terminated at any time by Presidential proclamation, provided, however, that if the President does not issue a repealing proclamation within 6 months after peace is declared, then the Congress by concurrent resolution can wipe this whole statute off the books.

There is not a patriotic soul among us who can find any fault with the authority granted in this bill. It is true that the bill does not include kidnaping and extortion. For my part, I should like to see the law made permanent so far as kidnaping and extortion are concerned. It was wire tapping that made it possible for the F. B. I. to solve several important kidnaping and extortion cases. This is the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the Judiciary Committee. Yet no one's civil rights were materially impinged upon. We have too many so-called liberals in the country who are eternally fretting about yielding up their individual privileges in behalf of the common good. With this group I have no patience.

In conclusion may I say that I have not changed my position at all since I advocated granting the President this emergency power in 1941. The necessities of the occasion are even greater today, and it is gratifying to know that this view is universally appreciated by the Members. Just another evidence of unity when our national life is at stake. It is this type of thing that is bound to win this war.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman thinks the elements who opposed it then have now seen the light of day and have become more patriotic?

Mr. MICHENER. In peacetimes we quarrel about our internal affairs. In wartimes we forget our differences of opinion and fight the common enemy.

Mr. MOTT. Of course, we do that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am very glad to have the gentleman refer back to about a year ago, when we had a similar bill before this House, because I recall that while that bill was under consideration in the gentleman's committee I was told by the head of the F. B. I. personally that due to their previous habit of tapping wires, telephone conversations, and so on, they had been following and keeping their fingers on the activities of several thousand known foreign agents in this country who have since become enemy aliens. I presume some such testimony was offered before the gentleman's committee. It seems to me very strange that this House a year ago did not pass this bill as requested by the President and by those bodies.

Mr. MICHENER. That is gone now; but may I say to the gentleman that practically every one of those agencies appeared before the committee last year opposing this bill. They called themselves liberal. They were opposed to this type of legislation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Not the agencies of the Government who were charged with following up these enemy agents?

Mr. MICHENER. No. This bill was sponsored by the Attorney General of the United States and by the President of the United States, and was defeated in this House by a vote of 153 to 146 on a roll-call vote on June 30, 1941.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan is very eloquent in defending this measure and in appealing to those who opposed any other measures having to do with wire tapping not to vote against this measure at this time, and finally asking the House as a whole to give this power to the President.

Without looking at the record, I think I was one who opposed the so-called Hobbs wire-tapping bill, but this is not the Hobbs bill by any means. The gentleman knows that just as well as I know it.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman point out the difference?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will point it out later in the debate.

The gentleman tells us the President should have this power. Why does not the gentleman from Michigan look at his own record and see how much power he has voted to give the President when the President appeal to this House for power prior to December 7?

Those of us who opposed the Hobbs bill had reason to oppose it. This bill confines itself to certain things which the gentleman mentioned. Of course, no one is going to oppose this kind of a measure, especially during wartime. But the gentleman should not indirectly criticize those who during peacetime thought it was not proper to let every wire in the

United States be tapped by Government officials who wanted to tap it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The bill before the House last year provided that no wire could be tapped unless the permission of the Attorney General was given in writing.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know that. This bill is a great deal different and is a war measure.

Mr. MICHENER. I may say in that connection that the open hearings recently held developed that on the 2d day of September 1941 the F. B. I. in Honolulu asked Mr. Hoover to get permission to tap the wire between Honolulu and Tokyo. Mr. Hoover made the application to the Attorney General, and the permission was given on October 22.

Mr. COCHRAN. That permission was given, I presume?

Mr. MICHENER. There was no wire tapping without the permission of the Attorney General.

Mr. COCHRAN. They got the permission?

Mr. MICHENER. On October 22.

Mr. COCHRAN. Did they learn that the Japs were going to visit Pearl Harbor on December 7?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know what the information was.

Mr. COCHRAN. Japan did not talk about attacking us over the telephone.

What I am talking about is that the gentleman from Michigan who, time and again, has stood on this floor and criticized those who wanted to give the President power, is now standing here criticizing some of us who did not care to vote for a wire-tapping bill before the emergency arose. That is what I am talking about.

Now, as to the bill we defeated last year, it provided that only the Bureau of Investigation could tap wires, and then only when granted permission by the Attorney General. It not only included espionage, sabotage, but also kidnaping and extortion cases. This bill, very properly, as a wartime measure, extends the power to not only the F. B. I. but also to the Intelligence Division of the War Department and the Office of Naval Intelligence in the conduct of investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war. There is a vast difference between the two bills.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE WIRE-TAPPING BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 310.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 310, with Mr. DAVIS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kindly expressions of opinion concerning me made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I may say I know of no more tireless, able, or painstaking Member of this House than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Chairman, it must be understood that this bill, House Joint Resolution 310, is strictly a war measure and is confined to war crimes. Its duration shall be only until 6 months after peace, or the President by order, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall determine by way of sooner determination or termination of the effective powers of the bill.

Specifically, the bill makes admissible in evidence information obtained by wire tapping in cases involving so-called war crimes like treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, and so forth, and the wire tapping, plus the use of evidence obtained by wire tapping is limited to those purposes enumerated in the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This bill does carry other limitations than those included in the bill that was voted on last June.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; it does.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A considerable number of new limitations have been written into the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; and, primarily, those limitations are that this is strictly a war measure for the duration of the war and it does not include so-called domestic crimes like kidnaping, and so forth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the other bill did include domestic crimes?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; it did include domestic crimes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. So this is not the same measure voted on last June?

Mr. CELLER. It is not, in that sense.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOTT. On account of the gentleman's special knowledge of this bill I wish he would clear up that point. I recall the provisions of the former bill which I supported, as I intend to support this bill, and it is my recollection that the former Hobbs bill was limited in duration to the emergency and that it was limited in scope to crimes which the

gentleman has just designated as war crimes. If that is the case I think the gentleman should clear it up so that there will not be any misunderstanding.

Mr. CELLER. At the time of the discussion of the Hobbs bill I was home ill, but if my memory serves me rightly from a reading of the debate, the bill went further in that regard than the instant bill. As I have stated, this bill is strictly limited to these war crimes beyond peradventure of a doubt. The gentleman can read them very carefully.

Mr. MOTT. I think the former Hobbs bill did include kidnaping, but outside of that I think it was entirely directed toward what the gentleman has described as war crimes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will ask the gentleman if the former bill, known as the Hobbs bill, did not also include espionage?

Mr. CELLER. I think that is correct.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. It also included extortion and it was not limited as to time, but was designed as permanent policy.

Mr. CELLER. As first drawn it was to be permanent law.

Mr. O'HARA. Oh, no.

Mr. CELLER. If I am wrong about that, I would like to be corrected.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman will refer back to the RECORD, he will find that I offered an amendment to limit it to 2 years.

Mr. CELLER. I am sorry. I did not recall.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. The RECORD of June 30, 1941, at page 5793, shows that this amendment was offered on a motion to recommit:

On page 2, line 2, after the words "United States" insert "without delegating his authority except to the Acting Attorney General in his absence"; and on page 3, after line 23, insert "This section shall remain in force and effect for a period of 2 years after its passage."

Mr. CELLER. Regardless of the differences, I think we can all agree that this particular bill has certain specific limitations not in the previous bill and this bill is applicable primarily to the war effort.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without regard to what happened when the bill was up last time—and I voted for its passage—the fact is that we need this legislation now, and the fact is that the declaration of war has taken place since the consideration of the last bill and the present time. Those are facts that are indisputable, and the necessity of winning the war demands the passage of this legislation, because the legislation is such that it may add to the winning of the war.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman. Nobody appeared specifically in opposition to the general principles underlying this bill. As a matter of fact, a representative of the office of American Federation of Labor had this to say:

I am authorized to say for the American Federation of Labor that, notwithstanding our previous well-known attitude toward this type of legislation, we shall not now oppose this legislation, provided it is made perfectly clear that the legislation is for the duration only.

Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress for Industrial Organizations, stated likewise that his organization favored the bill, but said that the suspension of the wire-tapping prohibitions should be limited in time to the duration of the war. That is in the bill. Also he said that the suspension should be severely limited in scope to the detection and apprehension of violators of laws designed to promote the national war effort. That is in the bill. Also that severe criminal penalties should be provided for any person using the power to tap wires, or any information so secured, for any purpose other than as evidence in connection with the prosecution for one of the described offenses. That is in the bill. Then he added a fourth provision that a specific declaration should be included to prevent the use of the wire-tapping power in any manner to destroy or interfere with the rights of organized labor.

That last provision we could not possibly and specifically comply with. Assuredly no effort will be made to hunt or hound labor. My record on labor is unassailable. I am a strong champion and friend of labor. If I thought for one moment labor would be hurt by this measure, I would oppose it. I shall be alert and ready to denounce anyone who would attempt to hurt labor by the provisions of this bill. Aside from that fourth condition, all of the conditions that he adverted to are covered by the language of the bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I understand that the Federal Lawyers' Association considered the matter and approved the bill with the provision that it be confined to the duration of the war.

Mr. CELLER. Most of the bar associations writing to us approved the bill on the condition that it be limited to the duration of the war. We think we have a bill here that should meet every possible contingency and every possible objection. Severe penalties are pre-

scribed for unauthorized uses of the evidence that might be obtained by wire tapping. There is a penalty provided of \$10,000 and/or 2 years in jail; no permission to tap wires can be given unless the national safety is threatened, or one of the prescribed crimes designated in the statutes is about to be committed. Unauthorized demands for copies of telegrams or communications are punishable by a fine, and unauthorized publication or use of communications is punishable. Evidence obtained in any unauthorized way cannot be used and it only can be used in the manner prescribed by the statute specifically and cannot otherwise be used.

We could not conjure up any other limitations. We put every possible safeguard in the bill to protect the rights of all parties, all citizens anywhere, everywhere in the United States. We feel that in the interest of the war effort, we should have this legislation. My State of New York, for example, has in its constitution the right to tap wires, and to use the evidence obtained in the detection of crimes. If we do not pass this legislation, we will have an anomalous situation. For example, a New York City policeman could tap a wire, whereas an F. B. I. agent could not, and in addition use the evidence obtained thereby. That is a ridiculous situation and we must cure that.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman state for the purpose of the record whether or not the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Military Intelligence and the Naval Intelligence may now act in the matter of tapping wires without getting anyone's consent to work separately or together as they see fit? Is not that true?

Mr. CELLER. I am glad that the gentleman asked that question. I had overlooked it. That is correct. The Army and the Naval Intelligence Divisions may act independently without getting any clearance from the Attorney General's office.

If we do not pass this bill, our treacherous alien enemies and spies residing in our midst will have the untrammelled and safe use of the channels of wire and wireless, but our Army, Navy, and Department of Justice will not.

Assuredly, the present wire-tapping prohibitions are not being observed by alien spies and espionage agents. Federal officials must obey the prohibitions. Army and Navy Intelligence officers cannot listen in, but Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese saboteurs can. Such a situation is woefully ridiculous.

In conclusion, I am deeply sensible of and thankful for the able assistance of my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. I am especially grateful to Mr. Frank Connell, clerk of the Judiciary Committee, for his painstaking research and studious inquiry. He was ever at my elbow aiding and advising me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the court and the jury are favorable, I think it would be foolish for me to indulge in any extended argument. Many a man has talked himself out of court when the judge was with him at the outset.

I am thoroughly familiar with this legislation. I discussed a similar bill 2 years ago and again last year, and I am perfectly ready to discuss it today if anybody desires to hear my views.

I hope there will be no opposition. Everyone must realize that we are engaged in warfare and that this is a war measure. When we know the land is filled with saboteurs, spies, and traitors, it is utter folly to deny to our intelligence departments of the Army and the Navy and the F. B. I. the usual weapons which are used all over the world to track down these desperate criminals, who are more dangerous to us than enemy troops in uniform.

The language of this bill is not satisfactory to everybody concerned with its preparation. It has been written and rewritten half a dozen times. The final version as you have it before you today represents the best efforts of the Judiciary Committee to compose our differences. I could go into detail and describe for you the reason for every word and phrase in it because I happened to be one of a subcommittee, together with my good friend from New York [Mr. CELLER], and my good friend from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who drafted the bill in its final form. If you wish to know the contents of the bill, the background of it and the explanation of it, I suggest that you read the report carefully.

I compliment the gentlemen from New York [Mr. CELLER], author of the bill, for his excellent work. I also compliment the very able and efficient clerk of the committee, Mr. Frank Connell, who actually drafted the report and was most helpful all through the consideration of the bill.

I will be pleased to answer any questions. I hope there will be none. I hope the debate will not be extended. I hope the bill will be passed unanimously. The President is for it. The Department of Justice is for it; the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy are for it. Everyone who opposed it a year ago, so far as I know, approves of it today. It is an essential measure. It should have been passed months ago.

I will not delay the passage of the bill today by taking any more time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, there would have been no Pearl Harbor attack had this bill been the law of the land before December 7, 1941. I make that statement unequivocally. I make it solemnly. I make it upon my own initiative and upon my own responsibility. It is true, as every member of the Judiciary Committee who heard the testimony

given in our executive session knows. We know whereof we speak, although we cannot take the Congress into our confidence.

This bill may yet prove essential. It differs from its precursors in several respects, but it is, on the whole, improved. It has been weakened materially in only one respect. Its life is limited to the war emergency as usually defined. We all wish that it had been the law and that the awful loss of life and the weakening of our Navy which occurred at Pearl Harbor might have been averted. But it is not too late to help win the war. It still can serve a useful purpose. Personally I think it ought to be permanent legislation, but I waive that and bow respectfully to the wisdom of my conferees on the committee.

Nor can I close these brief remarks without paying sincere tribute to the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] throughout its long and hard progress; and also to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], whose diligent and able work on the subcommittee was invaluable.

I also wish to pay tribute to Frank Connell, who has been more than helpful in every one of the many meetings we have had on this subject and in a hundred ways.

This bill should pass. It will pass. It must pass if we are to do our duty in behalf of America's war effort.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I agree, of course, with the majority leader in saying that we should consider this as a war measure, devoted to war crimes, limited to the duration of the war, without too much regard for ancient history.

For the purpose of putting the record straight, I feel I must comment on the defeat of the wire-tapping bill last June, and the effect of that defeat upon the events at Pearl Harbor. Existing law, as interpreted by the Attorney General and his predecessors, permits Government wire tapping. It does not permit the use of evidence gained thereby in prosecutions. In other words, the defeat of the Hobbs bill last June did not prevent wire tapping at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it not true that the Attorney General made a regulation that there should be no wire tapping by the F. B. I., Mr. Hoover's organization, without express permission of the Attorney General, and that Mr. Hoover and the F. B. I. made a personal request of the Attorney General for permission to tap wires on the 2d day of September 1941, and he did not get the permission until the 22d or the 27th day of October?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I believe that is correct.

Even if the Hobbs bill had passed the same condition would have obtained; the Attorney General would have had to give

his permission. Furthermore, as the gentleman's very statement points out, the F. B. I. got the authority from the Attorney General to tap wires at Pearl Harbor some 6 or 7 weeks before the disaster occurred. The point I am making is simply that it was not through any adverse vote in this House that the Government failed to utilize the power it already had at the time of Pearl Harbor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compare for the benefit of the Members of the House, in just a few instances, the bill which was before the House on June 30, 1941, and the present bill. I believe this will be helpful to the Committee in determining its policy respecting this legislation.

As has been said, just a few moments ago, the bill which was before the House, known as the Hobbs bill and which was under consideration on June 30, 1941, contained the provision that if the wires were to be tapped and the evidence were to be used in the prosecution of any case it must first go through the hands of the Attorney General of the United States. Everyone on the floor of the House this afternoon who was present during that particular debate will recall the reference made to the possible obstructions which might come in securing permission from the Attorney General, or a certificate from the Attorney General, for the purpose of tapping wires which would then make possible the use of that evidence in prosecutions.

The bill now before the House gives three agencies the power which in the Hobbs bill was delegated to the Attorney General: First, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice; second, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department; and, third, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department. And the crimes involved are treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, and violations of the act requiring registration of agents of foreign principals. These are the sole agencies which will have the power to direct the tapping of wires, and the crimes above recited are the crimes for which the authority may be extended to tap wires for the purpose of obtaining evidence. The Hobbs bill embraced domestic crimes, such as kidnaping and extortion. This bill does not contain any domestic crimes as a basis for wire tapping.

In this connection I want to call the attention of the membership, if I may, to the statement which was made by J. Edgar Hoover before the committee with reference to this particular bill now before us. I quote from the hearings:

Coming to the matter of this legislation, I think I should indicate what the procedure is in the Federal Bureau of Investigation today in connection with wire tapping.

The procedure that the Federal Bureau of Investigation follows today in regard to wire tapping is this: No agent in charge of any of the 56 field offices of the Bureau is authorized to tap a telephone wire. I myself am

not authorized to tap a telephone wire. If an agent in charge of any of the 56 field offices of the Bureau decides an investigation warrants the tapping of a telephone wire, he communicates with me here in Washington and I in turn transmit that request by memorandum to the Attorney General in accord with his instructions.

So if the pending bill should be passed the three agencies I have just mentioned; namely, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department would be the sole agencies which would have the power to authorize the tapping of wires, and this would be, only, to secure our national defense and security. The Hobbs bill was voted upon before we were attacked by Japan. Since December 7, 1941, great changes have occurred. We are not at peace now.

We must remember that we are in war; this is a war measure; this is an emergency measure, and under the express provisions of the bill itself this law will continue in force until the expiration of 6 months after the termination of the present war. We must win this war, and we must not leave anything undone which may contribute to our ultimate victory. The necessity of tapping wires in order to obtain evidence of treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, and violations of the act requiring the registration of foreign principals may become highly important at any time. The failure to pass this bill today might be the direct cause of great loss of property, or the commission of acts of treason whereby our Nation might suffer great and irreparable injury. Every American is vitally interested in this legislation; it is needed, and may I say that certain confidential communications given to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, by J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which the members of the committee cannot disclose, make certain the fact that this legislation is entirely justified as a war measure.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude my remarks I desire to express to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] my congratulations upon the presentation of this bill. It is purely a defense measure. We must extend our all-out effort to win this war to those protective measures which will make secure our Nation, and our people. This bill will do just that, and no more. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] has given much time and effort to this measure, and he is to be commended by the Members of the House, and by the country, for presenting this protective legislation.

I desire, also, to add my tribute to that fine and distinguished secretary of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Frank Connell, who has labored long and faithfully in the preparation of this bill. His efforts respecting this measure should be applauded by all. He is a faithful and loyal coworker of our great committee.

Mr. Chairman, as we approach the end of the debate on this war measure—

a measure which is protective, only in its character—and which will throw the arm of security about every American—our factories, shops, and mills will be made secure, and the American workers will find their machine and bench ready for them each day when the whistle blows; their opportunity to work will not be destroyed by the saboteur, and the people will be made safe and secure by this piece of legislation.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will pass without a dissenting vote in the House of Representatives. Let us say to the world that we will protect our people and our country, insofar as possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to add to the very able and informative explanations which have been made with reference to this bill. I want to direct attention to the fact that the attitude toward this bill as it is now presented is a fine indication and a fine example. During ordinary times—during peacetimes—Members divide; they have different attitudes; sometimes this aisle between Democrats and Republicans divides everybody; but it is a fine thing—it is a heartening thing—to observe that when your country faces danger—and unquestionably we face danger—party lines cease to obtain, and Members of this Congress, whether Democrats or Republicans, stand united for the defense of their common country. There is no solidifying, unifying, vitalizing, strengthening, protective thing for a people imperiled as we are comparable in its efficiency to a realization of a great common danger. During the past 2 or 3 weeks there seems to be a tendency to minimize our dangers, to stir up optimism, to magnify things in our favor and minimize those against us. Nothing could be more dangerous to the security of this country than that. That sort of thing breeds incaution and incaution results in such things as happened at Pearl Harbor. That does not help our morale. The people want the facts. They can take them raw. They have got the right to have them. There is not the slightest doubt that our country now faces the supreme danger in its existence.

We have had a very foolish notion in America that in some sort of way we were going to escape the test and the perils which other countries have faced. We have got over that notion now. The ease-loving, soft, self-centered, unfit people of yesterday, as if by magic almost, are coming to be virile people fit to win. It is for us to forget partisanship and personal ambition and to be fit servants of such a people. Tell them the truth. The truth is that we have not been winning this war, not yet. Everything we have is involved. Regardless of the past, we of this House must face the present and the future as we face this bill unitedly in this war situation.

There is no more solidifying influence that can be exerted among the people than the consciousness of a common

danger. The unanimity of the House toward this very identical piece of legislation is an evidence to the country that we believe we do face that character of danger which requires us to stand as a united people, with just one object, and that is to make this country secure. We have got to turn the tide of this war before we can win. It is running against us. We are not going to get ourselves in shape to do it by trying to deceive ourselves as to the seriousness of our danger. We are watchmen on the tower for our people. We do not have to hide things from them. They are as grown as we are. They are not jittery one bit. They know we are in danger. Nothing could do a greater hurt to our morale, to the confidence and trust between the people and their public officials and civilians in positions of leadership than for the impression to get abroad that things affecting the public security are being hidden from them, or our dangers minimized in our reports to them.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the passage of this bill will be unanimous today; at least I sincerely hope so, because the House has been fiddling and shadow boxing with this wire-tapping bill for some time. The gentleman from Alabama has well said that the tragedy of Pearl Harbor might have been avoided had this bill been the law prior to December 7, 1941.

I do want to compliment the author of the bill and the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that did a great deal of work upon it. Perhaps there are some in the Congress and some in the departments of our Government who have a very high sensitivity in reference to the proposition of wire tapping. As far as I am concerned, wire tapping ought to be permitted in the case of the violation of any Federal felony and not limited as it is limited by this bill. However, and with due respect to those who opposed the Hobbs bill on June 30, 1941, there is and has been the imperative need of this exceedingly important legislation with our country at war.

Mr. Chairman, while I am speaking, I would like also to pay high compliment to Mr. Connell, clerk of the committee. It is always a pleasure to go to him and ask for information, because he is always gracious and willing and tries to aid any member of the committee who comes to him. It is my hope that the Judiciary Committee will long have Mr. Connell as its clerk.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be rapidly acted upon by the Senate, because all you have to do to realize the importance of it is to read the report, and particularly page 29 of the last printed hearings on the bill. I am not only happy to have supported the previous measure, the so-called Hobbs bill, but I am equally happy to support this bill and to urge its passage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is second-guessing day. On this bill on which we are now so unanimous, we are divided between the "I told you so's" and the "alibis." I happen to be one of those who supported this bill when it was up last summer, and I got a good bit of scolding for it.

This bill has considerable historic importance as applied to the Pacific situation and to Pearl Harbor. Let me carry you back, while we are "second guessing" a little bit, to a document found on page 2657 of the Appendix of the Record of June 16, 1939, being the minority report of the Foreign Affairs Committee on the so-called neutrality bill, House Joint Resolution 306, the Bloom bill. During the hearings on our foreign policy leading up to that bill, we had heard many witnesses urging embargoes against Japan. I made a motion to consider the Japanese embargo bills which were pending before our committee, but my motion was tabled without even permitting me to speak.

With that background in mind, our minority report on the Bloom bill said:

THE PACIFIC SITUATION

We have attempted, without success, to secure consideration and action by our committee on the situation in the Orient. We feel that it is a mistake to try to determine our possible conduct as to future wars in Europe before we determine our conduct as to an existing war. We have let our excitement about what may happen to our remote interests in Europe blind us to what is now happening to our immediate interests in the Pacific, where our treaty rights are being violated and our national interests threatened every day. We feel certain that if we had solved this immediate far-eastern problem first it would have gone far toward solving the rest of our international problems.

If our country had carried out this minority proposal 3 years ago and had stopped arming Japan, Pearl Harbor might have been prevented.

Why bring that up? Not just to say "I told you so," but to remind us all to go carefully when we are all of one mind. There is a lot of talk here today about the need for unanimity. I think the need for being right is more important than the need for unanimity. I happen to be an "I told you so" man today on this bill, but there are many men whose judgment I respect who did not support this bill before, for this is a terrible power to give to the Government, in peace or war, the power that Justice Holmes has described as "a dirty business," eavesdropping on private conversations. I thought it was necessary under the circumstances last summer, and I think it is necessary now, but let those who do not feel that way now have the courage to state their views here. In the interest of unanimity we do not want to be stampeded into doing the wrong thing. We want to continue to be a deliberative body.

I am one of those who always view with some suspicion a unanimous vote, because I know that, human nature being what it is, a divided vote means that in all probability the measure received more careful consideration than one which was passed unanimously.

To those who are in the minority on votes we take today I say, be of good cheer. Often those who were in the minority in the past, as on this bill, or as some of us were in 1939 on the Pacific problem, come into the majority when the matter comes up for a second guess. On the other hand, when those of us who were in the minority find that time has brought the majority around to our views on a certain measure, let us not crow too much, let us not say too much about "I told you so"; we may be the ones who are proven wrong next time. Rather, let us try to continue to debate measures on their merits, without being stampeded, without recriminations, seeking to be right rather than unanimous.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Since I took the floor a few minutes ago to answer the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] I have looked over this bill and compared it with the bill on which we voted a year ago. In the first place, we were not at war at the time we voted on that bill. In the second place, we gave the entire power to one man. We extended that power solely to the Attorney General in the original bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think there are differences between this and the Hobbs bill and differences between the situation then and now which would justify a change in a man's vote. For myself, the fact that this bill does not include kidnapers and extortionists, as the Hobbs bill did, does not make this bill better. I concede that there are differences. Although in my judgment the two bills are substantially the same and the purpose that they seek to achieve is the same, I respect the judgment of those of my colleagues who feel that the differences are important enough for them to have voted the other way last time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not a fact also that the Hobbs bill considered last year never mentioned the Army or the Navy Intelligence Sections?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I rise to make just one observation. These gentlemen are concerned about how Members voted last year, or whenever it was. One time I was running for office and a man was accusing me of having cast a bad vote. I replied that I thought he was probably making a mistake about that particular vote, that I thought that was probably a very good vote, but if he wanted some campaign thunder and would come around to me I would show him some votes that I knew were wrong. Then I said, "Of course, I try to profit by my mistakes." Then I said to the audience, "All you fellows who never made any mistakes, vote for this other bird, and the rest of you vote for me, and I will count noses with him." I never

heard anything more about that particular vote.

I think that is about the situation with regard to how Members voted last year on this bill. Of course, stable people do not change often, but the only consistency anybody ought to aspire to is that each time he acts he uses then his latest and best judgment. The fine thing about it is that we are all standing together now voting for this bill as we must stand together generally for what we believe is in the interest of our country that is now engaged in war, facing the greatest fighting machine of all time, with everything we have or can hope for in the gravest sort of peril. Let the dead past bury its dead while we unitedly, with but one ambition, seek to be servants of a great democracy in this hour of its supreme peril.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department are authorized, in the conduct of investigations, to ascertain, prevent, or frustrate any interference or any attempts or plans for interference with the national security and defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, violations of the act requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals (act of June 8, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 631)), violations of the act requiring the registration of organizations carrying on certain activities within the United States (act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201)), or in any other manner, to require that telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications and copies or records thereof be disclosed and delivered to any authorized agent of any one of said investigational agencies, without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103): *Provided*, That no demand for the disclosure and delivery of telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications, or copies or records thereof, shall be made by any agency specified in this section unless and until such agency has received the approval of the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the head of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the head of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, as the case may be, or by such officer or official as may be designated by him. Such approval shall be given only when there is reasonable ground to believe that a violation of a law referred to in this section may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed, or the national safety is otherwise threatened. The information thus obtained shall be admissible in evidence.*

Sec. 2. No person shall fail to comply forthwith with the request of any duly authorized person, pursuant to this joint resolution, for the disclosure and surrender of any telegram, cablegram, radiogram, or other wire or radio communication, or copies or records thereof in his possession or under his control.

Sec. 3. No person shall divulge, publish, or use the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution otherwise than for the purposes hereinafter enumerated.

Sec. 4. Any information obtained by any one of the three investigational agencies

above named in the conduct of any investigation referred to in this resolution by means of intercepting, listening in on, or recording telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, and any other similar messages or communications, shall be admissible in evidence in any prosecution for any offense mentioned in this resolution, but not otherwise.

Sec. 5. Any person who willfully and knowingly violates any provision of this joint resolution shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution authorizes the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of the prosecution of the war to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934.

We are all agreed that any agents of these branches of the Government enumerated in this act may, without violation of law, intercept messages sent by wire by those who are about to commit a crime, but they cannot use these intercepted messages in evidence against those who are committing or are about to commit the crimes of treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, and other offenses against the security of this country.

At this time this Nation is engaged in a war for its national existence, and in the prosecution of this war we have builded into an army of defense and offense more than 2,000,000 of our young men; and before our war effort shall have ceased, in all human probability, we will have marshaled under the flag of this country as many as 10,000,000 of our finest, strongest, and best young men. There must be no fifth column in the rear of these men. We do know that those who would commit treason, sabotage, or any other crime interfering with the successful prosecution of the war may resort to, and have resorted to, the use of telegraph wires and telephone wires. If we refuse to enact this measure we say to those who are guilty of treason in this country, those who are guilty of sabotage, those who conspire to defeat our war efforts and bring death to our armed forces and defeat to our armies and our Navy, "You may go ahead and use with impunity these far-flung lines of communication which are calculated, if properly used, to make successful your efforts against your country." Yet we say to the Army and to the Navy and to the F. B. I., "You cannot listen in and use against these traitors, these saboteurs, those who are undertaking to defeat our war efforts, what they have said or what they have done in the use of these instrumentalities." Such a thing is monstrous and is an insult to the intelligence of everybody, and it is for these reasons that I shall support this measure and

arm our F. B. I. and our Army and our Navy officials with the power to listen in and get the conversations of these traitors, these saboteurs, and these people who are undertaking to hamstring and defeat the efforts of this country in maintaining our national existence. I voted for a measure similar to this one during the first session of this Congress. It was defeated by a vote of this House. I am reliably informed that if that measure had become a law and if the F. B. I., the intelligence departments of the Army and Navy had been permitted to listen in on the Japs at Honolulu, Pearl Harbor could not have been attacked and our fleet destroyed and our boys butchered on December 7, 1941.

The clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this joint resolution and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 7. For purposes of this joint resolution the term "person" shall include any individual, partnership, association, business trust, corporation, or any organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not.

Sec. 8. This joint resolution shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for six months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 310, pursuant to House Resolution 487, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERPAYMENTS ON TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2305) to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill has a unanimous report from the committee, the Army, the Navy, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General. They not only wrote letters asking for its immediate enactment, but sent

representatives before the committee at a hearing. I spoke to the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], this morning and also to the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments who were present—the minority members. There is no objection to its immediate consideration.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that this bill provides for the military the same rules that are applicable to the civilian departments or bureaus?

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely, and the Government is fully protected in every way from loss. There is no doubt about that as the Comptroller General says.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter no disbursing or certifying officer of the United States shall be held liable for overpayments made for transportation furnished on Government bills of lading or transportation requests when said overpayments are due to the use of improper transportation rates, classifications, or the failure to deduct the proper amount under land-grant laws or equalization and other agreements.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2508. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article by Robert L. Norton, in the Boston Post of Wednesday, May 22, 1942. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial entitled "Irving Cobb's Philosophy," from the Indianapolis Star of May 22, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have today be transferred to Tuesday next, after the disposition of business and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] who had a special order for today has relinquished that time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2508. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be postponed for approximately 2 weeks.

There will be a meeting of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 27, 1942.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, May 27, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 6858, H. R. 7044, House Joint Resolution 46, H. R. 3776, H. R. 4800, and H. R. 6370.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1672. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency in the amount of \$103,000, for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 737); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1673. A letter from the Chairman, National Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior to make exchanges with the Defense Homes Corporation of certain lands in northwest Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1674. A letter from the Director of Censorship, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, by extending the authority to censor communications to include communications between the continental United States and any Territory or possession, and any other Territory or possession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1675. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the use of certificates by officers of

the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1676. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 12, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the James River, Va., with a view to determining if any modification of the existing project is advisable, and particularly with a view to the improvement of Richmond Harbor by means of contraction works, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on January 24, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 738); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2175). Referred to the House Calendar.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. HARTER introduced a bill (H. R. 7139) for the relief of Carl Oplinger, a minor, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2938. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, supporting the economic program of the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2939. Also, petition of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, supporting the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2940. By Mr. OLIVER: Petition of sundry citizens of Eliot, Maine, supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2941. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Window Cleaners' Union, Local No. 44, San Francisco, Calif., supporting House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2942. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Townsend Club, No. 1, Ukiah, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2943. Also, petition of the General Welfare Association of Elgin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410, relative to the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.